



COURT FILE NUMBER 2301- 03179
 COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
 JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

COM
 Mar 9 2023

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF DYNAMIC TECHNOLOGIES GROUP INC., DYNAMIC ATTRACTIONS LTD., DYNAMIC ENTERTAINMENT GROUP LTD., DYNAMIC STRUCTURES LTD. and DYNAMIC ATTRACTIONS INC.

APPLICANTS DYNAMIC TECHNOLOGIES GROUP INC., DYNAMIC ATTRACTIONS LTD., DYNAMIC ENTERTAINMENT GROUP LTD., DYNAMIC STRUCTURES LTD. and DYNAMIC ATTRACTIONS INC.

DOCUMENT **BRIEF OF THE APPLICANT (INITIAL CCAA ORDER)**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT
 MLT AIKINS LLP
 Barristers and Solicitors
 2100, 222 3rd Avenue S.W.
 Calgary, Alberta T2P 0B4
 Phone: 403.693.5420/4347
 Fax: 403.508.4349
 Attention: Ryan Zahara/Catrina Webster
 File: 0119375.00031

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION, PARTIES, AND BACKGROUND - 2 -

II. ISSUE - 6 -

III. LAW AND ARGUMENT - 7 -

 A. THE CCAA APPLIES TO THE COMPANIES - 7 -

 B. THE COMPANIES QUALIFY AS AFFILIATED DEBTOR COMPANIES - 9 -

 C. THE COURT’S DISCRETION TO GRANT THE INITIAL ORDER - 10 -

 D. THE SET-OFF RIGHTS SHOULD BE STAYED - 12 -

 E. THE PROPOSED MONITOR SHOULD BE APPOINTED - 13 -

 F. THE JURISDICTION IS APPROPRIATE - 14 -

 G. THE PRIORITY CHARGES ARE NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE - 15 -

IV. REQUESTED RELIEF - 19 -

I. INTRODUCTION, PARTIES, AND BACKGROUND

1. This Brief is submitted on behalf of the Applicants, Dynamic Technologies Group Inc. (“**DTG**”), Dynamic Attractions Ltd. (“**DAL**”), Dynamic Entertainment Group Ltd. (“**DEGL**”), and Dynamic Structures Ltd. (“**DSL**”), and Dynamic Attractions Inc. (“**DAI**”, together with DTG, DAL, DEGL, and DSL, the “**Companies**” or the “**Dynamic Group**”) in support of an application (the “**Application**”) for an Initial Order pursuant to the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended (the “**CCAA**”).¹
2. The Dynamic Group will be filing the Affidavit of Allan Francis, to be sworn on March 8, 2023 (the “**Francis Affidavit**”), in support of their Originating Application for an Initial Order. Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein have the meaning given to them in the Francis Affidavit.²
3. The Companies are insolvent and have over \$5,000,000 in liabilities and the Companies qualify as affiliates pursuant to the CCAA. The Dynamic Group has satisfied the statutory conditions under the CCAA to obtain an Initial Order. The Application is supported by the Companies’ primary secured creditors. The Companies anticipate that they will shortly be in a position to conduct a sales and investment solicitation process (“**SISP**”).
4. DTG is the publicly traded company and its common shares are listed for trading the TSX Venture Exchange trading under the symbol "DTG". DTG is the public vehicle used to raise capital for the rest of the business conducted by the Dynamic Group. DTG currently has approximately 179,600,159 of issued and outstanding common shares. There were also at this time outstanding stock options for 7,820,000 common shares and outstanding common share purchase warrants for 16,000,000 common shares.³
5. DAL is a turnkey supplier of premium entertainment rides. Its proprietary product lines include, but are not limited to: high-tech theatres, special effects roller coasters, autonomous guided vehicles (tracked and trackless), independent drive and controlled “coaster vehicles”. Many aspects of DAL’s ride technology are protected with Canadian

¹ *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the “**CCAA**”), at **TAB A**.

² Affidavit of Allan Francis, sworn March 8, 2023 (the “**Francis Affidavit**”).

³ Francis Affidavit, at para. 24.

and international patents. DAL continues to provide custom design-build-commission services for major theme parks.⁴

6. DAL has delivered over USD\$700,000,000 of ride contracts with many receiving industry awards and becoming some of the most popular rides ever built.⁵
7. DAI is incorporated and registered pursuant to the laws of the State of Delaware and is also registered pursuant to the laws of the State of Texas and the State of Florida.⁶ DAI has a 25,000 square foot facility in Orlando, Florida, much of which has been sublet to other companies in the industry. DAI also has a physical location in Arlington, Texas out of which they provide maintenance services and replacement parts for ride systems that have been delivered to customers throughout the world. DAI also provides parts and service for rides built by other manufacturers.⁷
8. DEGL is incorporated and registered pursuant to the laws of Canada and is also extra-provincially registered in the Province of British Columbia and the Province of Ontario and was incorporated in order to operate and develop the co-venture business in North America as well as hold its investments in the co-venture business in China.⁸
9. DSL is incorporated and registered federally pursuant to the laws of Canada.⁹ DSL primarily provides design engineering and product research and development services for complex ride systems for DAL. DSL also designs sophisticated custom, complex, high precision mechanisms and integrated structures for third party customers.¹⁰
10. The Dynamic Group is in the business of designing, producing, engineering, and manufacturing, commissioning, warranting and providing ongoing parts and services to theme park owners around the world. The Dynamic Group has produced award-winning and cutting-edge theme park ride systems and attraction developments. The Dynamic Group has manufactured and engineered rides for major theme park owner/operators

⁴ Francis Affidavit, at para. 30.

⁵ Francis Affidavit, at para. 31.

⁶ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 18-20.

⁷ Francis Affidavit, at para. 34.

⁸ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 21-23 and 35.

⁹ Francis Affidavit, at para. 15.

¹⁰ Francis Affidavit, at para. 33.

including, Universal Studios and Disney, over the past 20 years and has 100 employees worldwide. DTG also uses these same turn-key services for special projects such as large optical telescope enclosures, specialty engineering, and custom steel fabrication services.¹¹

11. The Dynamic Group's business, like other businesses supporting the theme-park industry, suffered significantly due to the downturn in people attending theme parks during the global COVID-19 crisis. Many theme parks were forced to shut down due to COVID-19 restrictions, and when they re-opened, it was at reduced capacity. This loss of revenue by the theme parks had a flow-down effect on ride suppliers like the Dynamic Group. Many ride projects previously awarded by theme parks were cancelled and almost two years of theme park ride capital expenditure planning time was lost, limiting the number of large ride projects available to bid on. It also had a detrimental effect on many contracts that required extensive fabrication, commissioning and retrofitting on-site as these trades that were hampered by COVID-19 restrictions and quarantining of site personnel and countless mobilization, demobilization and remobilization orders, none of the significant costs of which were covered in the pre COVID-19, lump sum contract prices committed to by DAL.¹²
12. In addition, the Dynamic Group's current and recent historical financial performance has been negatively impacted by multiple "first-generation" projects which are defined as projects that were first of a kind in nature, posing significant technical and financial risks to the Dynamic Group to overcome these risks and deliver the projects successfully from a commercial standpoint. Overcoming these risks has been costly and has resulted in negative financial performance and significant liquidity constraints.¹³
13. The Dynamic Group has also suffered due to the increases to the costs of virtually all raw materials and subcontract services as well as higher labour and shipping costs over the last few years. In addition to that, increased lead times and procurement delays on various

¹¹ Francis Affidavit, at para. 25.

¹² Francis Affidavit, at para. 38.

¹³ Francis Affidavit, at para. 103.

raw materials components have slowed down the ability to execute secured work in a timely and efficient manner.¹⁴

14. In light of the significant slow-down in the large ride projects sector, the Dynamic Group is becoming increasingly unable to sustain the high cost of running its business. As a result of these challenges, management initiated a number of initiatives to help improve the Dynamic Group's operations, financial performance and liquidity.¹⁵
15. Despite these measures, including securing additional financing and reducing its workforce, the Dynamic Group continues to face a liquidity crisis, including the significant challenges associated with the liabilities associated with the Coaster Projects, and it no longer has access to capital markets to complete its restructuring efforts, even as theme parks continue to recover and the co-venture ride business proves its value.¹⁶
16. Given the Dynamic Group's decreasing financial performance and the overall negative lingering impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the theme park business, the Dynamic Group in consultation with its advisors, believes its in the best interests of all of its stakeholders to seek to pursue a SISP that will maximize the value of the Dynamic Group and allow it to compromise its significant historical liabilities through a restructured entity.¹⁷
17. As at December 31, 2022, the Dynamic Group had total liabilities of approximately \$94,453,000.00, including accounts payable and accrued liabilities of \$12,764,000.00, term loans (senior and subordinate) in the amount of \$26,320,000.00, and provisions on certain projects in the amount of \$6,107,000.00.¹⁸
18. The Dynamic Group meets the statutory requirements to be eligible for relief under the CCAA, as the Dynamic Group companies are insolvent and owe more than \$5,000,000.00¹⁹ to their creditors and qualify as affiliates pursuant to the CCAA.

¹⁴ Francis Affidavit, at para. 105.

¹⁵ Francis Affidavit, at para. 106.

¹⁶ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 107-110.

¹⁷ Francis Affidavit, at para. 111.

¹⁸ Francis Affidavit, at para. 65.

¹⁹ Francis Affidavit, at para. 114.

19. The Dynamic Group brings this application due to an urgent liquidity crisis. As described in more detail in the Francis Affidavit, the Dynamic Group's liquidity crisis is primarily due to lack of sufficient cash flow, over-budget and out of the money ride projects related to the special effects roller coasters, and significant secured and unsecured debt.²⁰
20. The Dynamic Group requires the protection and stability of the CCAA in order to stabilize their businesses and to conduct a SISF to maximize value for its stakeholders.²¹
21. The Dynamic Group further seeks certain Court-ordered charges over the Dynamic Group property, including an administrative charge in the maximum amount of \$100,000 as set out in the Francis Affidavit (the "**Administration Charge**"), a directors' and officers' charge in the maximum amount of \$250,000 as set out in the Francis Affidavit ("**Directors' Charge**"), and a charge (the "**Interim Lender's Charge**") respecting an interim financing facility term sheet in the maximum amount of \$2,600,000 (the "**Interim Financing**").²² These charges are necessary for the continued operation and successful restructuring of the Dynamic Group businesses.²³

II. ISSUE

22. There are five issues to be determined by this Honourable Court:
 - a. whether the CCAA applies to the Dynamic Group;
 - b. whether the requested stay of proceedings is necessary and appropriate in the circumstances;
 - c. whether the set-off rights of Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce ("**CIBC**") should be stayed in respect of the cash management system of the Companies;
 - d. whether the proposed Monitor should be appointed; and

²⁰ Francis Affidavit, at para. 39.

²¹ Francis Affidavit, at para. 101, 111, 116, 122 and 123.

²² Francis Affidavit, at paras. 97, 133, and 138.

²³ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 132, 134-137 and 143.

- e. whether the proposed priority charges for the Administration Charge, the Directors' Charge, and the Interim Lender's Charge are necessary and appropriate in the circumstances.

III. LAW AND ARGUMENT

A. The CCAA Applies to the Companies

23. The Court has jurisdiction to grant protection under the CCAA to a “debtor company” where the total claims against such company exceed \$5,000,000.²⁴ The CCAA defines “debtor company” as including “any company that is bankrupt or insolvent” – but it does not define “insolvent”.²⁵
24. While the CCAA does not define the term “insolvent” or “insolvency”, reference is commonly made to the definition of “insolvent person” under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 (the “**BIA**”). “[I]nsolvent person” is defined in section 2 of the BIA, as follows:

“insolvent person” means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.²⁶

25. If a company is insolvent under the BIA, it is necessarily insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.²⁷

²⁴ CCAA, section 3(1), at **TAB A**.

²⁵ CCAA, sections 2 and 3, at **TAB A**.

²⁶ *BIA*, at section 2, at **TAB B**; *Re Stelco Inc (2004)*, [2004] OJ No 1257 (Ont SCJ) (“**Stelco**”), at paras. 21-22, at **TAB C**.

²⁷ *Stelco*, at para. 22, at **TAB C**.

26. The CCAA is remedial legislation, which should be given a broad and liberal interpretation. A financially troubled company is insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA if it is “reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.”²⁸
27. In this case, the Companies are insolvent on a cash flow basis. As is disclosed in the Francis Affidavit, the Companies have suffered significant and sustained losses over the past several years, caused predominantly by significant slow-down in the large projects sector, declines related to the COVID-19 pandemic, increased costs associated with materials, service, labour, and shipping, lack of sufficient cash flow, over-budget and out of the money ride projects related to the special effects roller coasters, and significant secured and unsecured debt.²⁹
28. The Companies are also unable to pay the historical outstanding amounts that are currently due and owing to their unsecured creditors. The Companies’ liabilities greatly exceed the present value of their assets so the Companies are also balance sheet insolvent. Accordingly, the Companies are insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA and for the purposes of the BIA.
29. The Companies primary secured credit facilities advanced by PEL matured on February 28, 2023 and are currently due and owing by DTG, DAL, and have been guaranteed by DEGL, DAI and DSL.
30. As set out in the Francis Affidavit, the total claims against the Companies are significantly in excess of \$5,000,000.³⁰
31. The Companies therefore satisfy the statutory requirements of section 3(1) of the CCAA, i.e. the Dynamic Group are companies to which the CCAA applies.³¹
32. FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (“**FTI Consulting**”), a licenced trustee within the meaning of section 2(1) of the BIA, has consented to act as Court-appointed Monitor of the

²⁸ Stelco, at para 26, at **TAB C**.

²⁹ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 39, 104, 105, and 112.

³⁰ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 112-116.

³¹ CCAA, section 3(1), at **TAB A**.

Companies.³² As discussed in further detail below and with the Court’s consent, FTI Consulting is qualified to act in such capacity under section 11.7 of the CCAA.³³


B. The Companies Qualify as Affiliated Debtor Companies

33. The CCAA specifies that it applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total claims against the debtor company or affiliated companies, determined in accordance with section 20 of the CCAA, is more than \$5,000,000.³⁴ “[A]ffiliated companies” is defined in section 3(2) of the CCAA as follow:

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.³⁵

34. The corporate structure of the Dynamic Group as of February 2023 is as follows:³⁶



³² BIA, section 2, at **TAB B**.

³³ CCAA, section 11.7, at **TAB A**.

³⁴ CCAA, section 20, at **TAB A**.

³⁵ CCAA, section 3(2), at **TAB A**.

³⁶ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 7-23.

35. The Dynamic Group has debts in excess of \$5,000,000. As set out above, the Companies satisfy the definition of “affiliated companies” as defined in section 3(2) of the CCAA.
36. In *Jaguar Mining Inc., Re*, the Court granted CCAA protection to a debtor holding company and its subsidiaries.³⁷ The Court was satisfied that the debtor was a company to which the CCAA applied and extended the stay to the debtor’s U.S. subsidiaries as the debtor was dependent on them for income, and absent a stay, various creditors would be in a position to enforce claims, which could conceivably lead to a failed restructuring that would not be in the best interests of the debtor’s stakeholders.³⁸

C. The Court’s Discretion to Grant the Initial Order

37. An Initial Order under the CCAA should be granted if it accords with the remedial purposes of the CCAA, which include rehabilitation, the avoidance of social and economic loss resulting from liquidation, and the building of consensus among interested stakeholders.³⁹
38. An Initial Order may include any relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course during the restructuring period.⁴⁰
39. Such relief may (and indeed, typically does) include a stay of proceedings, which ensures that creditor enforcement does not interfere with the company’s ability to maintain operations while restructuring its affairs.⁴¹ The stay of proceedings maintains the status quo while the company develops a plan for the benefit of its creditors.⁴²
40. The threshold for a debtor company to obtain a stay of proceedings under the CCAA is low. The company only has to satisfy the Court that a stay of proceedings would “usefully

³⁷ *Jaguar Mining Inc., Re*, 2014 ONSC 494 (“*Jaguar Mining*”), at **TAB D**.

³⁸ *Jaguar Mining*, at para. 39, at **TAB D**.

³⁹ *Re Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd.*, 2010 SCC 60 at paras 15, 59, 70 (“*Century Services*”), at **TAB E**.

⁴⁰ CCAA, section 11.01, at **TAB A**; see also *Century Services*, at paras. 60-62, at **TAB E**.

⁴¹ CCAA, section 11.02, at **TAB A**.

⁴² *Re Lehndorff*, [1993] OJ No 14 (Ont SCJ) at paras 5-6, at **TAB F**; *Meridian Developments v Toronto Dominion Bank*, (1984), 53 AR 39 at para 21 (QB), **TAB G**.

further” its efforts to reorganize. The debtor company is not required to put forward anything more than a germ of a plan that requires protection.⁴³

41. Since November 1, 2019, when certain amendments to the CCAA became effective, any stay of proceedings in an Initial Order under the CCAA is restricted to ten days,⁴⁴ albeit subject to extension at the first comeback application and subsequently thereafter. This newly shortened initial stay period is meant to minimize prejudice to creditors who may have received short or no notice of the Initial Application. Any creditor with concerns about the adequacy of service is only required to wait ten days to make its case in opposition to the debtor company’s filing or the resulting stay of proceedings.
42. A debtor company is expected to act in good faith and with due diligence both before and after the commencement of proceedings under the CCAA; however, any in-depth analysis of good faith and due diligence is ordinarily deferred to subsequent applications.⁴⁵ In any event, the existence of financially challenging circumstances is not evidence of an absence of good faith or due diligence on the part of the debtor company.
43. Here, the Companies have acted with good faith and due diligence in addressing their cash flow and illiquidity, and by filing under the CCAA to facilitate a restructuring of their businesses and affairs.
44. PEL, the primary secured lender (the “**Interim Lender**”), has agreed to provide an interim lending facility pursuant to the terms of an executed term sheet (the “**Interim Financing Term Sheet**”).⁴⁶ The Interim Financing Term Sheet may serve as the basis for a credit agreement (the “**Interim Financing Agreement**”) to be negotiated and settled with the Interim Lender following the Initial Order if granted by this Honourable Court.⁴⁷ These documents provide the financial support to commence and conduct a SISP to maximize the value for the Companies stakeholders and seek a sale or additional investment in the Companies’ businesses.

⁴³ *Century Services*, at para. 70, at **TAB E**; *Industrial Properties Regina Limited v Copper Sands Land Corp*, 2018 SKCA 36 at para 21 (“**Industrial Properties**”), at **TAB H**; *Alberta Treasury Branches v Tallgrass Energy Corp*, 2013 ABQB 432, at para. 14, at **TAB I**.

⁴⁴ CCAA, section 11.02, at **TAB A**.

⁴⁵ *Industrial Properties*, at paras. 22-23, at **TAB H**.

⁴⁶ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 137-138.

⁴⁷ Francis Affidavit, at para. 138.

D. The Set-Off Rights Should be Stayed

45. In addition to the request for the granting of the CCAA Initial Order, the Companies seek a direction from this Honourable Court staying CIBC's ability to exercise its set-off rights.
46. Pursuant to section 21 of the CCAA, set-off rights are preserved and the Court has discretion to stay those rights and allow set-off rights to proceed.⁴⁸
47. In *Just Energy Corp*, the Court held that set-off rights of banks which would allow them to sweep accounts would be stayed on the basis that allowing those set-off rights would undermine any reorganization and would be contrary to the remedial purpose:

As part of the stay, Just Energy seeks an order precluding financial institutions from exercising any "sweep" remedies under their arrangements with Just Energy.

The concern is that the financial institutions would empty Just Energy's accounts by reason of a claim to a right of set off. Exercise of such rights would effectively undermine any reorganization by depriving Just Energy of working capital and thereby impairing its business. [emphasis added]

Although s. 21 of the CCAA preserves rights of set-off, the Court may defer the exercise of those rights. Section 21 does not exempt set-off rights from the stay. This differs from other provisions of the CCAA, which provide that certain rights are immune from the stay. As Savage J.A. of the British Columbia Court of Appeal observed, the broad discretion accorded to the CCAA Court to make orders in furtherance of the objectives of the statute must, as a matter of logic, extend to set-off.

Allowing banks to exercise a self-help remedy of sweeping the accounts by claiming set-off would in effect give them a preferred position over other creditors and deprive Just Energy of working capital. That would be contrary to the remedial purpose of the CCAA because it would ultimately shut down Just Energy and allow the banks to advantage themselves to the detriment of others in the process.

Just Energy had consulted widely with various stakeholder groups had before today's hearing. Those included the banks with sweep rights, at least some of whom were represented at today's hearing and did not object.

In the foregoing circumstances it is appropriate to at least temporarily stay the exercise of any rights of set-off by the banks.

⁴⁸ CCAA, section 21.

48. In the circumstances of this matter, CIBC has issued 3 letters of credit (the “L/Cs”): one to Genting Malaysia Berhad for the two active projects that the Dynamic Group has with Genting (USD\$944,095), one to Lotte World Adventure (Shenyang) Co., for an existing project that remains on hold (USD\$45,010) and one to Miral Asset Management (Theme Parks LLC) for the Mission Ferrari Abu Dhabi contract (USD\$1,687,107) totalling approximately USD\$2,676,212 on behalf of DAL.⁴⁹
49. Additionally, the L/Cs have been guaranteed in full by EDC pursuant to the PSG Certificate.⁵⁰
50. The Dynamic Group requires access to its cash management system during the pendency of the CCAA proceedings and any amounts advanced under the Interim Financing Facility must be available to be used for the restructuring of the Companies and cannot be subject to any pre-filing claims under the L/Cs or actions taken by CIBC to sweep available funds from the Companies bank accounts.
51. We respectfully submit that it is just and appropriate to stay the rights of CIBC to sweep the Companies bank accounts to satisfy any amounts called upon under the L/Cs. More particularly, the Companies seek to specifically stay the enforcement of the L/Cs against funds that are deposited into the Companies CIBC accounts after obtaining protection under the CCAA. CIBC will have recourse from EDC under the PSG Certificate for any amounts it is required to fund under the L/Cs.
52. This proposed relief is necessary and appropriate in the circumstances to ensure the Companies have a reasonable opportunity to restructure their affairs and without this relief, the restricting efforts would be impossible and would be thwarted by the collection of pre-filing amounts outstanding.

E. The Proposed Monitor Should be Appointed

53. Pursuant to section 11.7 of the CCAA, the Court is required to appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of a debtor company upon the granting of an initial CCAA

⁴⁹ Francis Affidavit, at para. 94.

⁵⁰ Francis Affidavit, at para. 74.

Order.⁵¹ The monitor must be a trustee within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the BIA and there are certain restrictions on who may be monitor set forth in subsection 11.7(2).⁵²

54. In this case, the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting, is a trustee within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the BIA, and has executed a Consent to Act in the within CCAA proceedings.⁵³

F. The Jurisdiction is Appropriate

55. Pursuant to section 9 of the CCAA, this Honourable Court may grant a CCAA Initial Order for a corporation which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assts of the company are situated.⁵⁴
56. In this case, DTG's registered office is located in Calgary, Alberta and each of DAL, DEGL, DSL, and DAI are subsidiaries of DTG.⁵⁵
57. Further, the Dynamic Group cash management system is administered by its CFO from Edmonton, Alberta.⁵⁶
58. The proper interpretation and application of s. 9 of the CCAA was considered in *Royal Bank v. Perfection Foods Ltd.*:

In my opinion, the "head office" of the companies means its registered head office. The situation here is identical to the facts in *Re Smith Transportation Co. Ltd.*, [1928] 2 D.L.R. 508, 10 C.B.R. 48, 62 O.L.R. 203. As to a company's "chief place of business", I was not cited any cases where this term has been explored. Determining a chief place of business is a question of fact and those facts concerning the companies and the businesses they conduct must be considered. The number of employees, the goods being sold, the length of time each aspect of the business has been carried on and the location where that has been done, the income and expenses of the company and its allocation between different

⁵¹ CCAA, section 11.7, at **TAB A**.

⁵² CCAA, s 11.7, at **TAB A**; BIA, s 2(1), "trustee" or "licensed trustee", at **TAB B**.

⁵³ CCAA, section 11.7(2), at **TAB A**.

⁵⁴ CCAA, section 9, at **TAB A**.

⁵⁵ Francis Affidavit, at paras. 7-23.

⁵⁶ Francis Affidavit, at para. 87.

aspects of the company are, I am sure, a few of the considerations to be dealt with.⁵⁷ [emphasis added]

59. Accordingly, the proper jurisdiction for the CCAA Initial Order is Alberta.

G. The Priority Charges are Necessary and Appropriate

60. The Companies seek approval of certain priority charges as part of the Initial Order, which are intended to secure payment of the Companies' obligations to their advisors, creditors and stakeholders (collectively, the "**Charges**"). The Charges are necessary and appropriate in the circumstances to ensure the Companies have a reasonable opportunity to restructure their affairs with support from key stakeholders.

61. The Charges are:

- a. the Administration Charge – to secure the professional fees of the proposed Monitor, the proposed Monitor's counsel and the Companies' counsel; and
- b. the Directors Charge – to secure the indemnity given by the Companies to their directors and officers; and
- c. the Interim Lender's Charge – to facilitate and finance the Companies' operations during the CCAA proceedings.

i. The Administration Charge

62. The CCAA authorizes the Court to grant a priority charge in respect of professional fees and disbursements on notice to affected secured creditors.⁵⁸

63. In *Re Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc.*,⁵⁹ the Ontario Superior Court of Justice stated that the factors to consider in determining whether to approve an administration charge include:

- a. the size and complexity of the businesses being restructured;

⁵⁷ *Oblats de Marie Immaculee du Manitoba, Re*, 2002 SKQB 161, at paras. 10-12, citing *Royal Bank v. Perfection Foods Ltd.*, 1991 CarswellPEI 116, at **TAB J**.

⁵⁸ CCAA, section 11.52, at **TAB A**.

⁵⁹ *Re Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 222 ("**Canwest**"), at para. 66, at **TAB K**.

- b. the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
 - c. whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
 - d. whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
 - e. the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
 - f. the position of the Monitor.⁶⁰
64. Courts have recognized that administration charges, as well as charges in favour of directors and officers, are often necessary to ensure a debtor company's successful restructuring. For example, in *Re Timminco*, Morawetz J. (now C.J.) stated that failing to provide such charges would "result in the overwhelming likelihood that the CCAA proceedings would come to an abrupt halt, followed, in all likelihood, by bankruptcy proceedings".⁶¹
65. In the within Action, an Administration Charge is necessary in light of the size and complexity of the restructuring and the necessary involvement of qualified professionals.
66. The Companies require the knowledge, expertise and continuing participation of the beneficiaries of the proposed Administration Charge in order to successfully restructure their significant debt.
67. The proposed quantum of the Administration Charge, in the amount of \$100,000.00, is reasonable in the circumstances for period of the initial stay of proceedings to March 19, 2023.
68. The amount of the proposed Administration Charge was reached in consultation with the proposed Monitor and the quantum is appropriate in light of the nature of the Companies' operations, the scope of duties of the Monitor, and the scope of duties of counsel to the Companies and the Monitor.⁶²

⁶⁰ *Canwest*, at para. 54, at **TAB K**.

⁶¹ *Re Timminco Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 506, at para. 66, at **TAB L**.

⁶² Francis Affidavit, at para. 134.

69. The primary secured creditors of the Dynamic Group were given notice of and are aware of the Companies' proposed Administration Charge. The Administration Charge is supported by the proposed Monitor and PEL.

ii. Directors' Charge

70. Under section 11.51 of the CCAA, the Court may grant a charge in favour of directors and officers in an amount the Court considers appropriate (Directors' Charge). The purpose of the Directors' Charge is to indemnify directors and officers against any obligations or liabilities that may arise after the Initial Order is granted.⁶³

71. As with other Charges, the Companies must give notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the Directors' Charge.

72. Section 11.51(4) of the CCAA provides that any Directors' Charge cannot apply to liabilities arising from gross negligence or wilful misconduct. This caveat is reflected in the template Initial CCAA Order (which was not modified in the Companies proposed form of Initial Order).⁶⁴

73. The purpose of a Directors' Charge is "to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring" in order to avoid destabilization and assist with the restructuring.⁶⁵

74. In this case, a successful restructuring of the Companies' businesses and affairs requires the continued participation of the directors and officers. These individuals have significant institutional knowledge and expertise that cannot be replicated, and they have a history of responsibility for key stakeholder relationships. In addition, the Companies' directors and officers have expressed the need for certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities during the CCAA proceedings.

⁶³ CCAA, section 11.51, at **TAB A**.

⁶⁴ CCAA, section 11.51(4), at **TAB A**.

⁶⁵ *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp*, [2009] OJ No 4286, 181 ACWS (3d) 853 (Ont SCJ) at para. 48, at **TAB M**.

75. The Alberta Template CCAA Initial Order contemplates a directors and officers charge that does not duplicate coverage already provided by directors and officers insurance. This has not changed in the Initial Order being sought by the Companies.
76. The amount of the Directors' Charge has been calculated based on the estimated exposure of the Directors and Officers and has been reviewed with the proposed Monitor.⁶⁶

iii. The Interim Lender's Charge

77. Pursuant to section 11.2 of the CCAA, the Court has authority to approve interim financing and grant a priority charge respecting the interim financing:

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

⁶⁶ Francis Affidavit, at para. 143.

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.⁶⁷

78. The secured creditors and other stakeholders have received notice of this application. Accordingly, an order approving the Interim Lender's Charge is appropriate if it accords with the factors set out in section 11.2 of the CCAA.
79. The Interim Financing and the Interim Lender's Charge is critical and necessary to the continuation of the Companies' operations. The Companies are proposing that the Interim Lender's Charge be capped at \$250,000 for the initial 10-day stay of proceedings and then expect to seek an increase to the Interim Lender's Charge to the full amount of the funds available under the Interim Financing Term Sheet.
80. We understand the proposed Monitor supports the Interim Financing and the Interim Lender's Charge.
81. Accordingly, the Companies respectfully submit that the Interim Financing and the Interim Lender's Charge should be approved.

IV. REQUESTED RELIEF

82. The Companies respectfully requests this Honourable Court grant an Initial CCAA Order substantially in the form attached to their Originating Application, including the stay of proceedings against CIBC in respect of the sweep of the Companies bank accounts.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of March 2023.

MLT AIKINS LLP



Ryan Zahara/Catrina Webster
Counsel for Dynamic Technologies Group Inc.,
Dynamic Attractions Ltd., Dynamic Entertainment
Group Ltd., Dynamic Attractions Inc., and Dynamic
Structures Ltd.

⁶⁷ CCAA, section 11.2.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

TAB	DESCRIPTION
A.	<i>Companies Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , RSC 1985, c C-36
B.	<i>Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act</i> , RSC 1985, c B-3
C.	<i>Re Stelco Inc (2004)</i> , [2004] OJ No 1257 (Ont SCJ)
D.	<i>Jaguar Mining Inc., Re</i> , 2014 ONSC 494
E.	<i>Re Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd.</i> , 2010 SCC 60
F.	<i>Re Lehndorff</i> , [1993] OJ No 14 (Ont SCJ)
G.	<i>Meridian Developments v. Toronto Dominion Bank</i> , (1984), 53 AR 39
H.	<i>Industrial Properties Regina Limited v. Copper Sands Land Corp</i> , 2018 SKCA 36
I.	<i>Alberta Treasury Branches v. Tallgrass Energy Corp</i> , 2013 ABQB 432
J.	<i>Oblats de Marie Immaculee du Manitoba, Re</i> , 2002 SKQB 161
K.	<i>Re Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc.</i> , 2010 ONSC 222
L.	<i>Re Timminco Ltd.</i> , 2012 ONSC 506
M.	<i>Re Canwest Global Communications Corp</i> , [2009] OJ No 4286, 181 ACWS (3d) 853 (Ont SCJ)

TAB A



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36

L.R.C. (1985), ch. C-36

Current to February 22, 2023

À jour au 22 février 2023

Last amended on November 1, 2019

Dernière modification le 1 novembre 2019

domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds. (*créancier chirographaire*)

Meaning of related and dealing at arm's length

(2) For the purpose of this Act, section 4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* applies for the purpose of determining whether a person is related to or dealing at arm's length with a debtor company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 2; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 10; 1990, c. 17, s. 4; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1993, c. 34, s. 52; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 120(E); 1998, c. 30, s. 14; 1999, c. 3, s. 22, c. 28, s. 154; 2001, c. 9, s. 575; 2002, c. 7, s. 133; 2004, c. 25, s. 193; 2005, c. 3, s. 15, c. 47, s. 124; 2007, c. 29, s. 104, c. 36, ss. 61, 105; 2012, c. 31, s. 419; 2015, c. 3, s. 37; 2018, c. 10, s. 89.

Application

3 (1) This Act applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total of claims against the debtor company or affiliated debtor companies, determined in accordance with section 20, is more than \$5,000,000 or any other amount that is prescribed.

Affiliated companies

(2) For the purposes of this Act,

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

a) Dans les provinces de la Nouvelle-Écosse, de la Colombie-Britannique et de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, la Cour suprême;

a.1) dans la province d'Ontario, la Cour supérieure de justice;

b) dans la province de Québec, la Cour supérieure;

c) dans les provinces du Nouveau-Brunswick, du Manitoba, de la Saskatchewan et d'Alberta, la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

c.1) dans la province de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, la Section de première instance de la Cour suprême;

d) au Yukon et dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, la Cour suprême et, au Nunavut, la Cour de justice du Nunavut. (*court*)

valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation La somme nette obtenue après compensation des obligations mutuelles des parties à un contrat financier admissible effectuée conformément à ce contrat. (*net termination value*)

Définition de personnes liées

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi, l'article 4 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'applique pour établir si une personne est liée à une compagnie débitrice ou agit sans lien de dépendance avec une telle compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 2; L.R. (1985), ch. 27 (2^e suppl.), art. 10; 1990, ch. 17, art. 4; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1993, ch. 34, art. 52; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 120(A); 1998, ch. 30, art. 14; 1999, ch. 3, art. 22, ch. 28, art. 154; 2001, ch. 9, art. 575; 2002, ch. 7, art. 133; 2004, ch. 25, art. 193; 2005, ch. 3, art. 15, ch. 47, art. 124; 2007, ch. 29, art. 104, ch. 36, art. 61 et 105; 2012, ch. 31, art. 419; 2015, ch. 3, art. 37; 2018, ch. 10, art. 89.

Application

3 (1) La présente loi ne s'applique à une compagnie débitrice ou aux compagnies débitrices qui appartiennent au même groupe qu'elle que si le montant des réclamations contre elle ou les compagnies appartenant au même groupe, établi conformément à l'article 20, est supérieur à cinq millions de dollars ou à toute autre somme prévue par les règlements.

Application

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi :

a) appartiennent au même groupe deux compagnies dont l'une est la filiale de l'autre ou qui sont sous le contrôle de la même personne;

b) sont réputées appartenir au même groupe deux compagnies dont chacune appartient au groupe d'une même compagnie.

PART II

Jurisdiction of Courts

Jurisdiction of court to receive applications

9 (1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.

Single judge may exercise powers, subject to appeal

(2) The powers conferred by this Act on a court may, subject to appeal as provided for in this Act, be exercised by a single judge thereof, and those powers may be exercised in chambers during term or in vacation.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 9.

Form of applications

10 (1) Applications under this Act shall be made by petition or by way of originating summons or notice of motion in accordance with the practice of the court in which the application is made.

Documents that must accompany initial application

- (2)** An initial application must be accompanied by
- (a)** a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
 - (b)** a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
 - (c)** copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

Publication ban

(3) The court may make an order prohibiting the release to the public of any cash-flow statement, or any part of a cash-flow statement, if it is satisfied that the release would unduly prejudice the debtor company and the making of the order would not unduly prejudice the company's creditors, but the court may, in the order, direct that the cash-flow statement or any part of it be made

PARTIE II

Juridiction des tribunaux

Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes

9 (1) Toute demande prévue par la présente loi peut être faite au tribunal ayant juridiction dans la province où est situé le siège social ou le principal bureau d'affaires de la compagnie au Canada, ou, si la compagnie n'a pas de bureau d'affaires au Canada, dans la province où est situé quelque actif de la compagnie.

Un seul juge peut exercer les pouvoirs, sous réserve d'appel

(2) Les pouvoirs conférés au tribunal par la présente loi peuvent être exercés par un seul de ses juges, sous réserve de l'appel prévu par la présente loi. Ces pouvoirs peuvent être exercés en chambre, soit durant une session du tribunal, soit pendant les vacances judiciaires.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 9.

Forme des demandes

10 (1) Les demandes prévues par la présente loi peuvent être formulées par requête ou par voie d'assignation introductive d'instance ou d'avis de motion conformément à la pratique du tribunal auquel la demande est présentée.

Documents accompagnant la demande initiale

- (2)** La demande initiale doit être accompagnée :
- a)** d'un état portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution hebdomadaire de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice;
 - b)** d'un rapport contenant les observations réglementaires de la compagnie débitrice relativement à l'établissement de cet état;
 - c)** d'une copie des états financiers, vérifiés ou non, établis au cours de l'année précédant la demande ou, à défaut, d'une copie des états financiers les plus récents.

Interdiction de mettre l'état à la disposition du public

(3) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, interdire la communication au public de tout ou partie de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice s'il est convaincu que sa communication causerait un préjudice indu à celle-ci et que sa non-communication ne causerait pas de préjudice indu à ses créanciers. Il peut toutefois préciser dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie de cet état

available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

- (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or
- (b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 10; 2005, ch. 47, art. 127.

Pouvoir général du tribunal

11 Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 11; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Redressements normalement nécessaires

11.001 L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 11 en même temps que l'ordonnance rendue au titre du paragraphe 11.02(1) ou pendant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe relativement à la demande initiale n'est limitée qu'aux redressements normalement nécessaires à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Droits des fournisseurs

11.01 L'ordonnance prévue aux articles 11 ou 11.02 ne peut avoir pour effet :

- a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués sans délai les paiements relatifs à la fourniture de marchandises ou de services, à l'utilisation de biens loués ou faisant l'objet d'une licence ou à la fourniture de toute autre contrepartie de valeur qui ont lieu après l'ordonnance;
- b) d'exiger le versement de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension : demande initiale

11.02 (1) Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de dix jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

- a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

(2) Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Preuve

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

Restriction

(4) L'ordonnance qui prévoit l'une des mesures visées aux paragraphes (1) ou (2) ne peut être rendue qu'en vertu du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128, 2007, ch. 36, art. 62(F); 2019, ch. 29, art. 137.

Suspension — administrateurs

11.03 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut interdire l'introduction ou la continuation de toute action contre les administrateurs de la compagnie relativement aux réclamations qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de la compagnie dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit, tant que la transaction ou l'arrangement, le cas échéant, n'a pas été homologué par le tribunal ou rejeté par celui-ci ou les créanciers.

before the regulatory body, other than the enforcement of a payment ordered by the regulatory body or the court.

Exception

(3) On application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body and to the persons who are likely to be affected by the order, the court may order that subsection (2) not apply in respect of one or more of the actions, suits or proceedings taken by or before the regulatory body if in the court's opinion

(a) a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company if that subsection were to apply; and

(b) it is not contrary to the public interest that the regulatory body be affected by the order made under section 11.02.

Declaration — enforcement of a payment

(4) If there is a dispute as to whether a regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor, the court may, on application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body, make an order declaring both that the regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor and that the enforcement of those rights is stayed.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2001, c. 9, s. 576; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 106, c. 36, s. 65.

11.11 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Priority — other orders

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the

organisme administratif, ni aux investigations auxquelles il procède à son sujet. Elles n'ont d'effet que sur l'exécution d'un paiement ordonné par lui ou le tribunal.

Exception

(3) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme administratif et à toute personne qui sera vraisemblablement touchée par l'ordonnance, déclarer que le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'une ou plusieurs des mesures prises par ou devant celui-ci, s'il est convaincu que, à la fois :

a) il ne pourrait être fait de transaction ou d'arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie si ce paragraphe s'appliquait;

b) l'ordonnance demandée au titre de l'article 11.02 n'est pas contraire à l'intérêt public.

Déclaration : organisme agissant à titre de créancier

(4) En cas de différend sur la question de savoir si l'organisme administratif cherche à faire valoir ses droits à titre de créancier dans le cadre de la mesure prise, le tribunal peut déclarer, par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme, que celui-ci agit effectivement à ce titre et que la mesure est suspendue.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2001, ch. 9, art. 576; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 106, ch. 36, art. 65.

11.11 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Financement temporaire

11.2 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté — d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué — en faveur de la personne nommée dans l'ordonnance qui accepte de prêter à la compagnie la somme qu'il approuve compte tenu de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de celle-ci. La charge ou sûreté ne peut garantir qu'une obligation postérieure au prononcé de l'ordonnance.

Priorité — créanciers garantis

(2) Le tribunal peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Priorité — autres ordonnances

(3) Il peut également y préciser que la charge ou sûreté n'a priorité sur toute autre charge ou sûreté grevant les biens de la compagnie au titre d'une ordonnance déjà

consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

Additional factor – initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65; 2019, c. 29, s. 138.

Assignment of agreements

11.3 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to every party to an agreement and the monitor, the court may make an order assigning the rights and obligations of the company under the agreement to any person who is specified by the court and agrees to the assignment.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of rights and obligations that are not assignable by reason of their nature or that arise under

rendue en vertu du paragraphe (1) que sur consentement de la personne en faveur de qui cette ordonnance a été rendue.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a) la durée prévue des procédures intentées à l'égard de la compagnie sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b) la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures;
- c) la question de savoir si ses dirigeants ont la confiance de ses créanciers les plus importants;
- d) la question de savoir si le prêt favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- e) la nature et la valeur des biens de la compagnie;
- f) la question de savoir si la charge ou sûreté causera un préjudice sérieux à l'un ou l'autre des créanciers de la compagnie;
- g) le rapport du contrôleur visé à l'alinéa 23(1)b).

Facteur additionnel : demande initiale

(5) Lorsqu'une demande est faite au titre du paragraphe (1) en même temps que la demande initiale visée au paragraphe 11.02(1) ou durant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe, le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (1) que s'il est également convaincu que les modalités du financement temporaire demandé sont limitées à ce qui est normalement nécessaire à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65; 2019, ch. 29, art. 138.

Cessions

11.3 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice et sur préavis à toutes les parties au contrat et au contrôleur, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, céder à toute personne qu'il précise et qui y a consenti les droits et obligations de la compagnie découlant du contrat.

Exceptions

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux droits et obligations qui, de par leur nature, ne peuvent être cédés ou qui découlent soit d'un contrat conclu à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la

Security or charge in favour of critical supplier

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

Priority

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2000, c. 30, s. 156; 2001, c. 34, s. 33(E); 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65.

Removal of directors

11.5 (1) The court may, on the application of any person interested in the matter, make an order removing from office any director of a debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act if the court is satisfied that the director is unreasonably impairing or is likely to unreasonably impair the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company or is acting or is likely to act inappropriately as a director in the circumstances.

Filling vacancy

(2) The court may, by order, fill any vacancy created under subsection (1).

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

11.51 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Restriction — indemnification insurance

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

Charge ou sûreté en faveur du fournisseur essentiel

(3) Le cas échéant, le tribunal déclare dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, en faveur de la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel, d'un montant correspondant à la valeur des marchandises ou services fournis en application de l'ordonnance.

Priorité

(4) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2000, ch. 30, art. 156; 2001, ch. 34, art. 33(A); 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65.

Révocation des administrateurs

11.5 (1) Sur demande d'un intéressé, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, révoquer tout administrateur de la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi s'il est convaincu que ce dernier, sans raisons valables, compromet ou compromettra vraisemblablement la possibilité de conclure une transaction ou un arrangement viable ou agit ou agira vraisemblablement de façon inacceptable dans les circonstances.

Vacance

(2) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, combler toute vacance découlant de la révocation.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants

11.51 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de celle-ci sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, en faveur d'un ou de plusieurs administrateurs ou dirigeants pour l'exécution des obligations qu'ils peuvent contracter en cette qualité après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Restriction — assurance

(3) Il ne peut toutefois rendre une telle ordonnance s'il estime que la compagnie peut souscrire, à un coût qu'il estime juste, une assurance permettant d'indemniser adéquatement les administrateurs ou dirigeants.

Negligence, misconduct or fault

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

11.52 (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a)** the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b)** any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c)** any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

- (a)** proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part; and
- (b)** an application under this Act by a bankrupt may only be made with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* but no application may be made under this Act by a bankrupt whose bankruptcy has resulted from

Négligence, inconduite ou faute

(4) Il déclare, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté ne vise pas les obligations que l'administrateur ou le dirigeant assume, selon lui, par suite de sa négligence grave ou de son inconduite délibérée ou, au Québec, par sa faute lourde ou intentionnelle.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais

11.52 (1) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, pour couvrir :

- a)** les débours et honoraires du contrôleur, ainsi que ceux des experts — notamment en finance et en droit — dont il retient les services dans le cadre de ses fonctions;
- b)** ceux des experts dont la compagnie retient les services dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi;
- c)** ceux des experts dont tout autre intéressé retient les services, si, à son avis, la charge ou sûreté était nécessaire pour assurer sa participation efficace aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Lien avec la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

11.6 Par dérogation à la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* :

- a)** les procédures intentées sous le régime de la partie III de cette loi ne peuvent être traitées et continuées sous le régime de la présente loi que si une proposition au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'a pas été déposée au titre de cette même partie;
- b)** le failli ne peut faire une demande au titre de la présente loi qu'avec l'aval des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aucune demande ne pouvant toutefois être faite si la faillite découle, selon le cas :

(i) the operation of subsection 50.4(8) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(ii) the refusal or deemed refusal by the creditors or the court, or the annulment, of a proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

1997, c. 12, s. 124.

Court to appoint monitor

11.7 (1) When an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company, the court shall at the same time appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. The person so appointed must be a trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

Restrictions on who may be monitor

(2) Except with the permission of the court and on any conditions that the court may impose, no trustee may be appointed as monitor in relation to a company

(a) if the trustee is or, at any time during the two preceding years, was

(i) a director, an officer or an employee of the company,

(ii) related to the company or to any director or officer of the company, or

(iii) the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, or a partner or an employee of the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, of the company; or

(b) if the trustee is

(i) the trustee under a trust indenture issued by the company or any person related to the company, or the holder of a power of attorney under an act constituting a hypothec within the meaning of the *Civil Code of Quebec* that is granted by the company or any person related to the company, or

(ii) related to the trustee, or the holder of a power of attorney, referred to in subparagraph (i).

Court may replace monitor

(3) On application by a creditor of the company, the court may, if it considers it appropriate in the circumstances, replace the monitor by appointing another trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 129.

(i) de l'application du paragraphe 50.4(8) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*,

(ii) du rejet — effectif ou présumé — de sa proposition par les créanciers ou le tribunal ou de l'annulation de celle-ci au titre de cette loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124.

Nomination du contrôleur

11.7 (1) Le tribunal qui rend une ordonnance sur la demande initiale nomme une personne pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières ou autres de la compagnie débitrice visée par la demande. Seul un syndic au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur.

Personnes qui ne peuvent agir à titre de contrôleur

(2) Sauf avec l'autorisation du tribunal et aux conditions qu'il peut fixer, ne peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur le syndic :

a) qui est ou, au cours des deux années précédentes, a été :

(i) administrateur, dirigeant ou employé de la compagnie,

(ii) lié à la compagnie ou à l'un de ses administrateurs ou dirigeants,

(iii) vérificateur, comptable ou conseiller juridique de la compagnie, ou employé ou associé de l'un ou l'autre;

b) qui est :

(i) le fondé de pouvoir aux termes d'un acte constitutif d'hypothèque — au sens du *Code civil du Québec* — émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci ou le fiduciaire aux termes d'un acte de fiducie émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci,

(ii) lié au fondé de pouvoir ou au fiduciaire visé au sous-alinéa (i).

Remplacement du contrôleur

(3) Sur demande d'un créancier de la compagnie, le tribunal peut, s'il l'estime indiqué dans les circonstances, remplacer le contrôleur en nommant un autre syndic, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, pour agir à ce titre à l'égard des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 129.

before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (a)(i) and (ii).

Exception

(2) A compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company may not deal with any claim that relates to any of the following debts or liabilities unless the compromise or arrangement explicitly provides for the claim's compromise and the creditor in relation to that debt has voted for the acceptance of the compromise or arrangement:

(a) any fine, penalty, restitution order or other order similar in nature to a fine, penalty or restitution order, imposed by a court in respect of an offence;

(b) any award of damages by a court in civil proceedings in respect of

(i) bodily harm intentionally inflicted, or sexual assault, or

(ii) wrongful death resulting from an act referred to in subparagraph (i);

(c) any debt or liability arising out of fraud, embezzlement, misappropriation or defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity or, in Quebec, as a trustee or an administrator of the property of others;

(d) any debt or liability resulting from obtaining property or services by false pretences or fraudulent misrepresentation, other than a debt or liability of the company that arises from an equity claim; or

(e) any debt for interest owed in relation to an amount referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d).

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 19; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 69.

Determination of amount of claims

20 (1) For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor is to be determined as follows:

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim is the amount

(i) in the case of a company in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act,

assujettie avant l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement, en raison d'une obligation contractée antérieurement à celle des dates mentionnées aux sous-alinéas a)(i) et (ii) qui est antérieure à l'autre.

Exception

(2) La réclamation se rapportant à l'une ou l'autre des dettes ou obligations ci-après ne peut toutefois être ainsi considérée, à moins que la transaction ou l'arrangement ne prévoie expressément la possibilité de transiger sur cette réclamation et que le créancier intéressé n'ait voté en faveur de la transaction ou de l'arrangement proposé :

a) toute ordonnance d'un tribunal imposant une amende, une pénalité, la restitution ou une autre peine semblable;

b) toute indemnité accordée en justice dans une affaire civile :

(i) pour des lésions corporelles causées intentionnellement ou pour agression sexuelle,

(ii) pour décès découlant d'un acte visé au sous-alinéa (i);

c) toute dette ou obligation résultant de la fraude, du détournement, de la concussion ou de l'abus de confiance alors que la compagnie agissait, au Québec, à titre de fiduciaire ou d'administrateur du bien d'autrui ou, dans les autres provinces, à titre de fiduciaire;

d) toute dette ou obligation résultant de l'obtention de biens ou de services par des faux-semblants ou la présentation erronée et frauduleuse des faits, autre qu'une dette ou obligation de la compagnie qui découle d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres;

e) toute dette relative aux intérêts dus à l'égard d'une somme visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d).

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 19; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 69.

Détermination du montant de la réclamation

20 (1) Pour l'application de la présente loi, le montant de la réclamation d'un créancier garanti ou chirographaire est déterminé de la façon suivante :

a) le montant d'une réclamation non garantie est celui :

(i) dans le cas d'une compagnie en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(ii) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act, or

(iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim is the amount, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company is, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, as the case may be, and, in the case of any other company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

Admission of claims

(2) Despite subsection (1), the company may admit the amount of a claim for voting purposes under reserve of the right to contest liability on the claim for other purposes, and nothing in this Act, the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* prevents a secured creditor from voting at a meeting of secured creditors or any class of them in respect of the total amount of a claim as admitted.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 20; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 70.

Law of set-off or compensation to apply

21 The law of set-off or compensation applies to all claims made against a debtor company and to all actions instituted by it for the recovery of debts due to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if the company were plaintiff or defendant, as the case may be.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Classes of Creditors

Company may establish classes

22 (1) A debtor company may divide its creditors into classes for the purpose of a meeting to be held under section 4 or 5 in respect of a compromise or arrangement relating to the company and, if it does so, it is to apply to

(ii) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(iii) dans le cas de toute autre compagnie, dont la preuve peut être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, mais si le montant ainsi prouvable n'est pas admis par la compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier;

b) le montant d'une réclamation garantie est celui dont la preuve pourrait être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la réclamation n'était pas garantie, mais ce montant, s'il n'est pas admis par la compagnie, est, dans le cas où celle-ci est assujettie à une procédure pendante sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* ou de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, établi par preuve de la même manière qu'une réclamation non garantie sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois, selon le cas, et, s'il s'agit de toute autre compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier.

Admission des réclamations

(2) Malgré le paragraphe (1), la compagnie peut admettre le montant d'une réclamation aux fins de votation sous réserve du droit de contester la responsabilité quant à la réclamation pour d'autres objets, et la présente loi, la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* et la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'ont pas pour effet d'empêcher un créancier garanti de voter à une assemblée de créanciers garantis ou d'une catégorie de ces derniers à l'égard du montant total d'une réclamation ainsi admis.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 20; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 70.

Compensation

21 Les règles de compensation s'appliquent à toutes les réclamations produites contre la compagnie débitrice et à toutes les actions intentées par elle en vue du recouvrement de ses créances, comme si elle était demanderesse ou défenderesse, selon le cas.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Catégories de créanciers

Établissement des catégories de créanciers

22 (1) La compagnie débitrice peut établir des catégories de créanciers en vue des assemblées qui seront tenues au titre des articles 4 ou 5 relativement à une transaction ou un arrangement la visant; le cas échéant, elle

TAB B



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act

Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité

R.S.C., 1985, c. B-3

L.R.C. (1985), ch. B-3

Current to February 22, 2023

À jour au 22 février 2023

Last amended on September 1, 2022

Dernière modification le 1 septembre 2022

income trust means a trust that has assets in Canada if

- (a) its units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the date of the initial bankruptcy event, or
- (b) the majority of its units are held by a trust whose units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the date of the initial bankruptcy event; (*fiducie de revenu*)

insolvent person means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

- (a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,
- (b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or
- (c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due; (*personne insolvable*)

legal counsel means any person qualified, in accordance with the laws of a province, to give legal advice; (*conseiller juridique*)

locality of a debtor means the principal place

- (a) where the debtor has carried on business during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event,
- (b) where the debtor has resided during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event, or
- (c) in cases not coming within paragraph (a) or (b), where the greater portion of the property of the debtor is situated; (*localité*)

Minister means the Minister of Industry; (*ministre*)

net termination value means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation*)

official receiver means an officer appointed under subsection 12(2); (*séquestre officiel*)

(b) il a résidé au cours de l'année précédant l'ouverture de sa faillite;

(c) se trouve la plus grande partie de ses biens, dans les cas non visés aux alinéas a) ou b). (*locality of a debtor*)

localité d'un débiteur [Abrogée, 2005, ch. 47, art. 2(F)]

ministre Le ministre de l'Industrie. (*Minister*)

moment de la faillite S'agissant d'une personne, le moment :

- a) soit du prononcé de l'ordonnance de faillite la visant;
- b) soit du dépôt d'une cession de biens la visant;
- c) soit du fait sur la base duquel elle est réputée avoir fait une cession de biens. (*time of the bankruptcy*)

opération sous-évaluée Toute disposition de biens ou fourniture de services pour laquelle le débiteur ne reçoit aucune contrepartie ou en reçoit une qui est manifestement inférieure à la juste valeur marchande de celle qu'il a lui-même donnée. (*transfer at undervalue*)

ouverture de la faillite Relativement à une personne, le premier en date des événements suivants à survenir :

- a) le dépôt d'une cession de biens la visant;
- b) le dépôt d'une proposition la visant;
- c) le dépôt d'un avis d'intention par elle;
- d) le dépôt de la première requête en faillite :
 - (i) dans les cas visés aux alinéas 50.4(8) a) et 57 a) et au paragraphe 61(2),
 - (ii) dans le cas où la personne, alors qu'elle est visée par un avis d'intention déposé aux termes de l'article 50.4 ou une proposition déposée aux termes de l'article 62, fait une cession avant que le tribunal ait approuvé la proposition;
- e) dans les cas non visés à l'alinéa d), le dépôt de la requête à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite est rendue;
- f) l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*. (*date of the initial bankruptcy event*)

personne

(c) the event that causes an assignment by the person to be deemed; (*moment de la faillite*)

title transfer credit support agreement means an agreement under which an insolvent person or a bankrupt has provided title to property for the purpose of securing the payment or performance of an obligation of the insolvent person or bankrupt in respect of an eligible financial contract; (*accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit*)

transfer at undervalue means a disposition of property or provision of services for which no consideration is received by the debtor or for which the consideration received by the debtor is conspicuously less than the fair market value of the consideration given by the debtor; (*opération sous-évaluée*)

trustee or licensed trustee means a person who is licensed or appointed under this Act. (*syndic ou syndic autorisé*)

R.S., 1985, c. B-3, s. 2; R.S., 1985, c. 31 (1st Supp.), s. 69; 1992, c. 1, s. 145(F), c. 27, s. 3; 1995, c. 1, s. 62; 1997, c. 12, s. 1; 1999, c. 28, s. 146, c. 31, s. 17; 2000, c. 12, s. 8; 2001, c. 4, s. 25, c. 9, s. 572; 2004, c. 25, s. 7; 2005, c. 3, s. 11, c. 47, s. 2; 2007, c. 29, s. 91, c. 36, s. 1; 2012, c. 31, s. 414; 2015, c. 3, s. 6(F); 2018, c. 10, s. 82.

Designation of beneficiary

2.1 A change in the designation of a beneficiary in an insurance contract is deemed to be a disposition of property for the purpose of this Act.

1997, c. 12, s. 2; 2004, c. 25, s. 8; 2005, c. 47, s. 3.

Superintendent's division office

2.2 Any notification, document or other information that is required by this Act to be given, forwarded, mailed, sent or otherwise provided to the Superintendent, other than an application for a licence under subsection 13(1), shall be given, forwarded, mailed, sent or otherwise provided to the Superintendent at the Superintendent's division office as specified in directives of the Superintendent.

1997, c. 12, s. 2.

3 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 4]

Definitions

4 (1) In this section,

entity means a person other than an individual; (*entité*)

surintendant des institutions financières Le surintendant des institutions financières nommé en application du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur le Bureau du surintendant des institutions financières*. (*Superintendent of Financial Institutions*)

syndic ou **syndic autorisé** Personne qui détient une licence ou est nommée en vertu de la présente loi. (*trustee or licensed trustee*)

tribunal Sauf aux alinéas 178(1)a) et a.1) et aux articles 204.1 à 204.3, tout tribunal mentionné aux paragraphes 183(1) ou (1.1). Y est assimilé tout juge de ce tribunal ainsi que le greffier ou le registraire de celui-ci, lorsqu'il exerce les pouvoirs du tribunal qui lui sont conférés au titre de la présente loi. (*court*)

union de fait Relation qui existe entre deux conjoints de fait. (*common-law partnership*)

valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation La somme nette obtenue après compensation des obligations mutuelles des parties à un contrat financier admissible effectuée conformément à ce contrat. (*net termination value*)

L.R. (1985), ch. B-3, art. 2; L.R. (1985), ch. 31 (1^{er} suppl.), art. 69; 1992, ch. 1, art. 145(F), ch. 27, art. 3; 1995, ch. 1, art. 62; 1997, ch. 12, art. 1; 1999, ch. 28, art. 146, ch. 31, art. 17; 2000, ch. 12, art. 8; 2001, ch. 4, art. 25, ch. 9, art. 572; 2004, ch. 25, art. 7; 2005, ch. 3, art. 11, ch. 47, art. 2; 2007, ch. 29, art. 91, ch. 36, art. 1; 2012, ch. 31, art. 414; 2015, ch. 3, art. 6(F); 2018, ch. 10, art. 82.

Désignation de bénéficiaires

2.1 La modification de la désignation du bénéficiaire d'une police d'assurance est réputée être une disposition de biens pour l'application de la présente loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 2; 2004, ch. 25, art. 8; 2005, ch. 47, art. 3.

Bureau de division

2.2 Sauf dans le cas de la demande de licence prévue au paragraphe 13(1), les notifications et envois de documents ou renseignements à effectuer au titre de la présente loi auprès du surintendant le sont au bureau de division spécifié par ses instructions.

1997, ch. 12, art. 2.

3 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 4]

Définitions

4 (1) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent au présent article.

entité Personne autre qu'une personne physique. (*entity*)

TAB C

Most Negative Treatment: Recently added (treatment not yet designated)

Most Recent Recently added (treatment not yet designated): [In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) | 2023 ONSC 753, 2023 CarswellOnt 1528 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Jan 30, 2023)

2004 CarswellOnt 1211
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Stelco Inc., Re

2004 CarswellOnt 1211, [2004] O.J. No. 1257, [2004] O.T.C. 284, 129 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1065, 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT WITH
RESPECT TO STELCO INC. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Farley J.

Heard: March 5, 2004

Judgment: March 22, 2004

Docket: 04-CL-5306

Counsel: Michael E. Barrack, James D. Gage, Geoff R. Hall for Applicants
David Jacobs, Michael McCreary for Locals, 1005, 5328, 8782 of the United Steel Workers of America
Ken Rosenberg, Lily Harmer, Rob Centa for United Steelworkers of America
Bob Thornton, Kyla Mahar for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor of the Applicants
Kevin J. Zych for Informal Committee of Stelco Bondholders
David R. Byers for CIT
Kevin McElcheran for GE
Murray Gold, Andrew Hatnay for Retired Salaried Beneficiaries
Lewis Gottheil for CAW Canada and its Local 523
Virginie Gauthier for Fleet
H. Whiteley for CIBC
Gail Rubenstein for FSCO
Kenneth D. Kraft for EDS Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.1 General principles](#)

[XIX.1.b Qualifying company](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application of Act
Steel company S Inc. applied for protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("CCAA"\)](#) on January 29, 2004 —
Union locals moved to rescind initial order and dismiss initial application of S Inc. and its subsidiaries on ground S Inc. was not

"debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of CCAA because S Inc. was not insolvent — Motion dismissed — Given time and steps involved in reorganization, condition of insolvency perforce required expanded meaning under CCAA — Union affiant stated that S Inc. will run out of funding by November 2004 — Given that November was ten months away from date of filing, S Inc. had liquidity problem — S Inc. realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access to further outside funding — S Inc. had negative equity of \$647 million — On balance of probabilities, S Inc. was insolvent and therefore was "debtor company" as at date of filing and entitled to apply for CCAA protection.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Farley J.*:

- A Debtor (No. 64 of 1992), Re* (1993), [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Eng. Ch. Div.) — considered
- Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 2254, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) — considered
- Bank of Montreal v. I.M. Krisp Foods Ltd.* (1996), [1997] 1 W.W.R. 209, 140 D.L.R. (4th) 33, 148 Sask. R. 135, 134 W.A.C. 135, 6 C.P.C. (4th) 90, 1996 CarswellSask 581 (Sask. C.A.) — considered
- Barsi v. Farcas* (1923), [1924] 1 W.W.R. 707, 2 C.B.R. 299, 18 Sask. L.R. 158, [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154, 1923 CarswellSask 227 (Sask. C.A.) — referred to
- Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex* (2002), 2002 SCC 42, 2002 CarswellBC 851, 2002 CarswellBC 852, 100 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, [2002] 5 W.W.R. 1, 212 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 287 N.R. 248, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 289, 166 B.C.A.C. 1, 271 W.A.C. 1, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 189, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 (S.C.C.) — considered
- Challmie, Re* (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78, 1976 CarswellBC 63 (B.C. S.C.) — considered
- Clarkson v. Sterling* (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Ont. C.P.) — considered
- Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd., Re* (1986), 69 B.C.L.R. 273, 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156, 1986 CarswellBC 481 (B.C. S.C.) — considered
- Cumberland Trading Inc., Re* (1994), 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225, 1994 CarswellOnt 255 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Davidson v. Douglas* (1868), 15 Gr. 347, 1868 CarswellOnt 167 (Ont. Ch.) — considered
- Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of)* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133, 1991 CarswellOnt 168 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
- Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp.* (1999), 1999 CarswellOnt 2213, 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Gagnier, Re* (1950), 30 C.B.R. 74, 1950 CarswellOnt 101 (Ont. S.C.) — considered
- Gardner v. Newton* (1916), 10 W.W.R. 51, 26 Man. R. 251, 29 D.L.R. 276, 1916 CarswellMan 83 (Man. K.B.) — considered
- Inducon Development Corp., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306, 1991 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered
- Kenwood Hills Development Inc., Re* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44, 1995 CarswellOnt 38 (Ont. Bkcty.) — considered
- King Petroleum Ltd., Re* (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76, 1978 CarswellOnt 197 (Ont. S.C.) — considered
- Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisioners Maritimes Ltd.* (1989), 92 N.S.R. (2d) 283, 75 C.B.R. (N.S.) 317, 45 B.L.R. 14, 237 A.P.R. 283, 1989 CarswellNS 27 (N.S. T.D.) — considered
- Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14, (sub nom. *Timber Lodge Ltd. v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada (No. 1)*) 101 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 73, (sub nom. *Timber Lodge Ltd. v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada (No. 1)*) 321 A.P.R. 73, 1992 CarswellPEI 13 (P.E.I. C.A.) — referred to
- MTM Electric Co., Re* (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29, 1982 CarswellOnt 170 (Ont. Bkcty.) — considered
- New Quebec Raglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen* (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 93, 1993 CarswellOnt 173 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
- Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1990 CarswellOnt 139 (Ont. C.A.) — considered
- Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.* (2001), 2001 CarswellOnt 2954, 16 B.L.R. (3d) 74, 28 C.B.R. (4th) 294 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp. (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 5210, 46 C.B.R. (4th) 313, (sub nom. *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Bankrupt) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*) 180 O.A.C. 158 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Optical Recording Laboratories Inc., Re (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 64, 75 D.L.R. (4th) 747, 42 O.A.C. 321, (sub nom. *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc. v. Digital Recording Corp.*) 1 O.R. (3d) 131, 1990 CarswellOnt 143 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Pacific Mobile Corp., Re (1979), 32 C.B.R. (N.S.) 209, 1979 CarswellQue 76 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc. (1993), 103 D.L.R. (4th) 609, 49 C.P.R. (3d) 456, 64 O.A.C. 274, 15 O.R. (3d) 730, 10 B.L.R. (2d) 109, 1993 CarswellOnt 149 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc. (1993), 49 C.P.R. (3d) ix, 10 B.L.R. (2d) 244 (note), 104 D.L.R. (4th) vii, 68 O.A.C. 21 (note), 164 N.R. 78 (note), 16 O.R. (3d) xvi (S.C.C.) — referred to

R. v. Proulx (2000), [2000] 4 W.W.R. 21, 2000 SCC 5, 2000 CarswellMan 32, 2000 CarswellMan 33, 140 C.C.C. (3d) 449, 30 C.R. (5th) 1, 182 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 249 N.R. 201, 49 M.V.R. (3d) 163, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61, 142 Man. R. (2d) 161, 212 W.A.C. 161 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312, 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621, 1991 CarswellOnt 220 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co. (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 7, 21 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 1993 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

TDM Software Systems Inc., Re (1986), 60 C.B.R. (N.S.) 92, 1986 CarswellOnt 203 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157, 1986 CarswellBC 499 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Webb v. Stenton (1883), 11 Q.B.D. 518 (Eng. C.A.) — referred to

633746 Ontario Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 72, 73 O.R. (2d) 774, 1990 CarswellOnt 181 (Ont. S.C.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) "insolvent person" — referred to

s. 2(1) "insolvent person" (a) — considered

s. 2(1) "insolvent person" (b) — considered

s. 2(1) "insolvent person" (c) — considered

s. 43(7) — referred to

s. 121(1) — referred to

s. 121(2) — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 2 "debtor company" — referred to

s. 2 "debtor company" (a) — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" (b) — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" (c) — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" (d) — considered

s. 12 — referred to

s. 12(1) "claim" — referred to

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Generally — referred to

Words and phrases considered:

debtor company

It seems to me that the [*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36] test of insolvency . . . which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the [*Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3] definition of [s. 2(1)] (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.

MOTION by union that steel company was not "debtor company" as defined in *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Farley J.:

1 As argued this motion by Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 United Steel Workers of America (collectively "Union") to rescind the initial order and dismiss the application of Stelco Inc. ("Stelco") and various of its subsidiaries (collectively "Sub Applicants") for access to the protection and process of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") was that this access should be denied on the basis that Stelco was not a "debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA because it was not insolvent.

2 Allow me to observe that there was a great deal of debate in the materials and submissions as to the reason(s) that Stelco found itself in with respect to what Michael Locker (indicating he was "an expert in the area of corporate restructuring and a leading steel industry analyst") swore to at paragraph 12 of his affidavit was the "current crisis":

12. Contending with weak operating results and resulting tight cash flow, management has deliberately chosen not to fund its employee benefits. By contrast, Dofasco and certain other steel companies have consistently funded both their employee benefit obligations as well as debt service. If Stelco's management had chosen to fund pension obligations, presumably with borrowed money, *the current crisis* and related restructuring plans would focus on debt restructuring as opposed to the reduction of employee benefits and related liabilities. [Emphasis added.]

3 For the purpose of determining whether Stelco is insolvent and therefore could be considered to be a debtor company, it matters not what the cause or who caused the financial difficulty that Stelco is in as admitted by Locker on behalf of the Union. The management of a corporation could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the corporation could be in the grip of ruthless, hard hearted and hard nosed outside financiers; the corporation could be the innocent victim of uncaring policy of a level of government; the employees (unionized or non-unionized) could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the relationship of labour and management could be absolutely poisonous; the corporation could be the victim of unforeseen events affecting its viability such a as a fire destroying an essential area of its plant and equipment or of rampaging dumping. One or more or all of these factors (without being exhaustive), whether or not of varying degree and whether or not in combination of some may well have been the cause of a corporation's difficulty. The point here is that Stelco's difficulty exists; the only question is whether Stelco is insolvent within the meaning of that in the "debtor company" definition of the CCAA. However, I would point out, as I did in closing, that no matter how this motion turns out, Stelco does have a problem which has to be addressed - addressed within the CCAA process if Stelco is insolvent or addressed outside that process if Stelco is determined not to be insolvent. The status quo will lead to ruination of Stelco (and its Sub Applicants) and as a result will very badly affect its stakeholder, including pensioners, employees (unionized and non-unionized), management, creditors, suppliers, customers, local and other governments and the local communities. In such situations, time is a precious commodity; it cannot be wasted; no matter how much some would like to take time outs, the clock cannot be stopped. The watchwords of the Commercial List are equally applicable in such circumstances. They are communication, cooperation and common sense.

I appreciate that these cases frequently invoke emotions running high and wild; that is understandable on a human basis but it is the considered, rational approach which will solve the problem.

4 The time to determine whether a corporation is insolvent for the purpose of it being a "debtor company" and thus able to make an application to proceed under the CCAA is the date of filing, in this case January 29, 2004.

5 The Monitor did not file a report as to this question of insolvency as it properly advised that it wished to take a neutral role. I understand however, that it did provide some assistance in the preparation of Exhibit C to Hap Steven's affidavit.

6 If I determine in this motion that Stelco is not insolvent, then the initial order would be set aside. See *Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14 (P.E.I. C.A.). The onus is on Stelco as I indicated in my January 29, 2004 endorsement.

7 S. 2 of the CCAA defines "debtor company" as:

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ["BIA"] or deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound-up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

8 Counsel for the Existing Stelco Lenders and the DIP Lenders posited that Stelco would be able to qualify under (b) in light of the fact that as of January 29, 2004 whether or not it was entitled to receive the CCAA protection under (a) as being insolvent, it had ceased to pay its pre-filing debts. I would merely observe as I did at the time of the hearing that I do not find this argument attractive in the least. The most that could be said for that is that such game playing would be ill advised and in my view would not be rewarded by the exercise of judicial discretion to allow such an applicant the benefit of a CCAA stay and other advantages of the procedure for if it were capriciously done where there is not reasonable need, then such ought not to be granted. However, I would point out that if a corporation did capriciously do so, then one might well expect a creditor-initiated application so as to take control of the process (including likely the ouster of management including directors who authorized such unnecessary stoppage); in such a case, while the corporation would not likely be successful in a corporation application, it is likely that a creditor application would find favour of judicial discretion.

9 This judicial discretion would be exercised in the same way generally as is the case where s. 43(7) of the BIA comes into play whereby a bankruptcy receiving order which otherwise meets the test may be refused. See *Kenwood Hills Development Inc., Re* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44 (Ont. Bkcty.) where at p. 45 I observed:

The discretion must be exercised judicially based on credible evidence; it should be used according to common sense and justice and in a manner which does not result in an injustice: See *Re Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Ltd.* (1971), 16 C.B.R. (NS) 158 (Man. Q.B.).

10 Anderson J. in *MTM Electric Co., Re* (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29 (Ont. Bkcty.) at p. 30 declined to grant a bankruptcy receiving order for the eminently good sense reason that it would be counterproductive: "Having regard for the value of the enterprise and having regard to the evidence before me, I think it far from clear that a receiving order would confer a benefit on anyone." This common sense approach to the judicial exercise of discretion may be contrasted by the rather more puzzling approach in *TDM Software Systems Inc., Re* (1986), 60 C.B.R. (N.S.) 92 (Ont. S.C.).

11 The Union, supported by the International United Steel Workers of America ("International"), indicated that if certain of the obligations of Stelco were taken into account in the determination of insolvency, then a very good number of large Canadian corporations would be able to make an application under the CCAA. I am of the view that this concern can be addressed as follows. The test of insolvency is to be determined on its own merits, not on the basis that an otherwise technically insolvent corporation should not be allowed to apply. However, if a technically insolvent corporation were to apply and there was no material advantage to the corporation and its stakeholders (in other words, a pressing need to restructure), then one would expect that the court's discretion would be judicially exercised against granting CCAA protection and ancillary relief. In the case of Stelco, it is recognized, as discussed above, that it is in crisis and in need of restructuring - which restructuring, if it is insolvent, would be best accomplished within a CCAA proceeding. Further, I am of the view that the track record of CCAA proceedings in this country demonstrates a healthy respect for the fundamental concerns of interested parties and stakeholders. I have consistently observed that much more can be achieved by negotiations outside the courtroom where there is a reasonable exchange of information, views and the exploration of possible solutions and negotiations held on a without prejudice basis than likely can be achieved by resorting to the legal combative atmosphere of the courtroom. A mutual problem requires a mutual solution. The basic interest of the CCAA is to rehabilitate insolvent corporations for the benefit of all stakeholders. To do this, the cause(s) of the insolvency must be fixed on a long term viable basis so that the corporation may be turned around. It is not achieved by positional bargaining in a tug of war between two parties, each trying for a larger slice of a defined size pie; it may be achieved by taking steps involving shorter term equitable sacrifices and implementing sensible approaches to improve productivity to ensure that the pie grows sufficiently for the long term to accommodate the reasonable needs of the parties.

12 It appears that it is a given that the Sub Applicants are in fact insolvent. The question then is whether Stelco is insolvent.

13 There was a question as to whether Stelco should be restricted to the material in its application as presented to the Court on January 29, 2004. I would observe that CCAA proceedings are not in the nature of the traditional adversarial lawsuit usually found in our courtrooms. It seems to me that it would be doing a disservice to the interest of the CCAA to artificially keep the Court in the dark on such a question. Presumably an otherwise deserving "debtor company" would not be allowed access to a continuing CCAA proceeding that it would be entitled to merely because some potential evidence were excluded for traditional adversarial technical reasons. I would point out that in such a case, there would be no prohibition against such a corporation reapplying (with the additional material) subsequently. In such a case, what would be the advantage for anyone of a "pause" before being able to proceed under the rehabilitative process under the CCAA. On a practical basis, I would note that all too often corporations will wait too long before applying, at least this was a significant problem in the early 1990s. In *Inducon Development Corp., Re (1991)*, 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I observed:

Secondly, CCAA is designed to be remedial; it is not, however, designed to be preventative. CCAA should not be the last gasp of a dying company; it should be implemented, if it is to be implemented, at a stage prior to the death throes.

14 It seems to me that the phrase "death throes" could be reasonably replaced with "death spiral". In *Cumberland Trading Inc., Re (1994)*, 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), I went on to expand on this at p. 228:

I would also observe that all too frequently debtors wait until virtually the last moment, the last moment, or in some cases, beyond the last moment before even beginning to think about reorganizational (and the attendant support that any successful reorganization requires from the creditors). I noted the lamentable tendency of debtors to deal with these situations as "last gasp" desperation moves in *Re Inducon Development Corp. (1992)*, 8 C.B.R. (3d) 308 (Ont. Gen. Div.). To deal with matters on this basis minimizes the chances of success, even if "success" may have been available with earlier spade work.

15 I have not been able to find in the CCAA reported cases any instance where there has been an objection to a corporation availing itself of the facilities of the CCAA on the basis of whether the corporation was insolvent. Indeed, as indicated above, the major concern here has been that an applicant leaves it so late that the timetable of necessary steps may get impossibly compressed. That is not to say that there have not been objections by parties opposing the application on various other grounds. Prior to the 1992 amendments, there had to be debentures (plural) issued pursuant to a trust deed; I recall that in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990)*, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.), the initial application was

rejected in the morning because there had only been one debenture issued but another one was issued prior to the return to court that afternoon. This case stands for the general proposition that the CCAA should be given a large and liberal interpretation. I should note that there was in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp.* (1999), 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) a determination that in a creditor application, the corporation was found not to be insolvent, but see below as to BIA test (c) my views as to the correctness of this decision.

16 In *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) I observed at p. 32:

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors.

17 In *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), the court stated to the same effect:

The second submission is that the plan is contrary to the purposes of the CCAA. Courts have recognized that the purpose of the CCAA is to enable compromises to be made for the common benefit of the creditors and the company and to keep the company alive and out of the hands of liquidators.

18 Encompassed in this is the concept of saving employment if a restructuring will result in a viable enterprise. See *Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of)* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133 (Ont. Gen. Div.). This concept has been a continuing thread in CCAA cases in this jurisdiction stretching back for at least the past 15 years, if not before.

19 I would also note that the jurisprudence and practical application of the bankruptcy and insolvency regime in place in Canada has been constantly evolving. The early jails of what became Canada were populated to the extent of almost half their capacity by bankrupts. Rehabilitation and a fresh start for the honest but unfortunate debtor came afterwards. Most recently, the *Bankruptcy Act* was revised to the BIA in 1992 to better facilitate the rehabilitative aspect of making a proposal to creditors. At the same time, the CCAA was amended to eliminate the threshold criterion of there having to be debentures issued under a trust deed (this concept was embodied in the CCAA upon its enactment in 1933 with a view that it would only be large companies with public issues of debt securities which could apply). The size restriction was continued as there was now a threshold criterion of at least \$5 million of claims against the applicant. While this restriction may appear discriminatory, it does have the practical advantage of taking into account that the costs (administrative costs including professional fees to the applicant, and indeed to the other parties who retain professionals) is a significant amount, even when viewed from the perspective of \$5 million. These costs would be prohibitive in a smaller situation. Parliament was mindful of the time horizons involved in proposals under BIA where the maximum length of a proceeding including a stay is six months (including all possible extensions) whereas under CCAA, the length is in the discretion of the court judicially exercised in accordance with the facts and the circumstances of the case. Certainly sooner is better than later. However, it is fair to observe that virtually all CCAA cases which proceed go on for over six months and those with complexity frequently exceed a year.

20 Restructurings are not now limited in practical terms to corporations merely compromising their debts with their creditors in a balance sheet exercise. Rather there has been quite an emphasis recently on operational restructuring as well so that the emerging company will have the benefit of a long term viable fix, all for the benefit of stakeholders. See *Sklar-Pepler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 314 where Borins J. states:

The proposed plan exemplifies the policy and objectives of the Act as it proposes a regime for the court-supervised reorganization for the Applicant company intended to avoid the devastating social and economic effects of a creditor-initiated termination of its ongoing business operations and enabling the company to carry on its business in a manner in which it is intended to cause the least possible harm to the company, its creditors, its employees and former employees and the communities in which it carries on and carried on its business operations.

21 The CCAA does not define "insolvent" or "insolvency". Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2004 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto, Carswell; 2003) at p. 1107 (N5) states:

In interpreting "debtor company", reference must be had to the definition of "insolvent person" in s. 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* . . .

To be able to use the Act, a company must be bankrupt or insolvent: *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75. The company must, in its application, admit its insolvency.

22 It appears to have become fairly common practice for applicants and others when reference is made to insolvency in the context of the CCAA to refer to the definition of "insolvent person" in the BIA. That definition is as follows:

s. 2(1) . . .

"insolvent person" means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, and whose liability to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

23 Stelco acknowledges that it does not meet the test of (b); however, it does assert that it meets the test of both (a) and (c). In addition, however, Stelco also indicates that since the CCAA does not have a reference over to the BIA in relation to the (a) definition of "debtor company" as being a company that is "(a) bankrupt or insolvent", then this term of "insolvent" should be given the meaning that the overall context of the CCAA requires. See the modern rule of statutory interpretation which directs the court to take a contextual and purposive approach to the language of the provision at issue as illustrated by *Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 (S.C.C.) at p. 580:

Today there is only one principle or approach, namely the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

24 I note in particular that the (b), (c) and (d) aspects of the definition of "debtor company" all refer to other statutes, including the BIA; (a) does not. S. 12 of the CCAA defines "claims" with reference over to the BIA (and otherwise refers to the BIA and the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*). It seems to me that there is merit in considering that the test for insolvency under the CCAA may differ somewhat from that under the BIA, so as to meet the special circumstances of the CCAA and those corporations which would apply under it. In that respect, I am mindful of the above discussion regarding the time that is usually and necessarily (in the circumstances) taken in a CCAA reorganization restructuring which is engaged in coming up with a plan of compromise and arrangement. The BIA definition would appear to have been historically focussed on the question of bankruptcy - and not reorganization of a corporation under a proposal since before 1992, secured creditors could not be forced to compromise their claims, so that in practice there were no reorganizations under the former *Bankruptcy Act* unless all secured creditors voluntarily agreed to have their secured claims compromised. The BIA definition then was essentially useful for being a pre-condition to the "end" situation of a bankruptcy petition or voluntary receiving order where the upshot would be a realization on the bankrupt's assets (not likely involving the business carried on - and certainly not by the bankrupt). Insolvency under the BIA is also important as to the Paulian action events (eg., fraudulent preferences, settlements) as to the conduct of the debtor prior to the bankruptcy; similarly as to the question of provincial preference legislation. Reorganization under a plan or proposal, on the contrary, is with a general objective of the applicant continuing to exist, albeit that the CCAA may also be used to have an orderly disposition of the assets and undertaking in whole or in part.

25 It seems to me that given the time and steps involved in a reorganization, and the condition of insolvency perforce requires an expanded meaning under the CCAA. Query whether the definition under the BIA is now sufficient in that light for

the allowance of sufficient time to carry through with a realistically viable proposal within the maximum of six months allowed under the BIA? I think it sufficient to note that there would not be much sense in providing for a rehabilitation program of restructuring/reorganization under either statute if the entry test was that the applicant could not apply until a rather late stage of its financial difficulties with the rather automatic result that in situations of complexity of any material degree, the applicant would not have the financial resources sufficient to carry through to hopefully a successful end. This would indeed be contrary to the renewed emphasis of Parliament on "rescues" as exhibited by the 1992 and 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.

26 Allow me now to examine whether Stelco has been successful in meeting the onus of demonstrating with credible evidence on a common sense basis that it is insolvent within the meaning required by the CCAA in regard to the interpretation of "debtor company" in the context and within the purpose of that legislation. To a similar effect, see *PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc.* (1993), 103 D.L.R. (4th) 609 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed [(1993), 49 C.P.R. (3d) ix (S.C.C.)] wherein it was determined that the trial judge was correct in holding that a party was not insolvent and that the statutory definition of insolvency pursuant to the BIA definition was irrelevant to determine that issue, since the agreement in question effectively provided its own definition by implication. It seems to me that the CCAA test of insolvency advocated by Stelco and which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the BIA definition of (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring. That is, there should be a reasonable cushion, which cushion may be adjusted and indeed become in effect an encroachment depending upon reasonable access to DIP between financing. In the present case, Stelco accepts the view of the Union's affiant, Michael Mackey of Deloitte and Touche that it will otherwise run out of funding by November 2004.

27 On that basis, allow me to determine whether Stelco is insolvent on the basis of (i) what I would refer to as the CCAA test as described immediately above, (ii) BIA test (a) or (iii) BIA test (c). In doing so, I will have to take into account the fact that Stephen, albeit a very experienced and skilled person in the field of restructurings under the CCAA, unfortunately did not appreciate that the material which was given to him in Exhibit E to his affidavit was modified by the caveats in the source material that in effect indicated that based on appraisals, the fair value of the real assets acquired was in excess of the purchase price for two of the U.S. comparators. Therefore the evidence as to these comparators is significantly weakened. In addition at Q. 175-177 in his cross examination, Stephen acknowledged that it was reasonable to assume that a purchaser would "take over some liabilities, some pension liabilities and OPEB liabilities, for workers who remain with the plant." The extent of that assumption was not explored; however, I do note that there was acknowledgement on the part of the Union that such an assumption would also have a reciprocal negative effect on the purchase price.

28 The BIA tests are disjunctive so that anyone meeting any of these tests is determined to be insolvent: see *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc., Re* (1990), 75 D.L.R. (4th) 747 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 756; *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 161. Thus, if I determine that Stelco is insolvent on *any one* of these tests, then it would be a "debtor company" entitled to apply for protection under the CCAA.

29 In my view, the Union's position that Stelco is not insolvent under BIA (a) because it has not entirely used up its cash and cash facilities (including its credit line), that is, it is not yet as of January 29, 2004 run out of liquidity conflates inappropriately the (a) test with the (b) test. The Union's view would render the (a) test necessarily as being redundant. See *R. v. Proulx*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61 (S.C.C.) at p. 85 for the principle that no legislative provision ought to be interpreted in a manner which would "render it mere surplusage." Indeed the plain meaning of the phrase "unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due" requires a construction of test (a) which permits the court to take a purposive assessment of a debtor's ability to meet his future obligations. See *King Petroleum Ltd., Re* (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76 (Ont. S.C.) where Steele J. stated at p. 80:

With respect to cl. (a), it was argued that at the time the disputed payments were made the company was able to meet its obligations as they generally became due because no major debts were in fact due at that time. This was premised on the fact that the moneys owed to Imperial Oil were not due until 10 days after the receipt of the statements and that the statements had not then been received. I am of the opinion that this is not a proper interpretation of cl. (a). *Clause (a) speaks in the present and future tenses and not in the past.* I am of the opinion that the company was an "insolvent person" within the meaning of cl. (a) because by the very payment-out of the money in question it placed itself in a position that

it was unable to meet its obligations as they would generally become due. In other words, it had placed itself in a position that it would not be able to pay the obligations that it knew it had incurred and which it knew would become due in the immediate future. [Emphasis added.]

30 *King Petroleum Ltd.* was a case involving the question in a bankruptcy scenario of whether there was a fraudulent preference during a period when the corporation was insolvent. Under those circumstances, the "immediate future" does not have the same expansive meaning that one would attribute to a time period in a restructuring forward looking situation.

31 Stephen at paragraphs 40-49 addressed the restructuring question in general and its applicability to the Stelco situation. At paragraph 41, he outlined the significant stages as follows:

The process of restructuring under the CCAA entails a number of different stages, the most significant of which are as follows:

- (a) identification of the debtor's stakeholders and their interests;
- (b) arranging for a process of meaningful communication;
- (c) dealing with immediate relationship issues arising from a CCAA filing;
- (d) sharing information about the issues giving rise to the debtor's need to restructure;
- (e) developing restructuring alternatives; and
- (f) building a consensus around a plan of restructuring.

32 I note that January 29, 2004 is just 9-10 months away from November 2004. I accept as correct his conclusion based on his experience (and this is in accord with my own objective experience in large and complicated CCAA proceedings) that Stelco would have the liquidity problem within the time horizon indicated. In that regard, I also think it fair to observe that Stelco realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access further outside funding. To bridge the gap it must rely upon the stay to give it the uplift as to pre-filing liabilities (which the Union misinterpreted as a general turnaround in its cash position without taking into account this uplift). As well, the Union was of the view that recent price increases would relieve Stelco's liquidity problems; however, the answers to undertaking in this respect indicated:

With respect to the Business Plan, the average spot market sales price per ton was \$514, and the average contract business sales price per ton was \$599. The Forecast reflects an average spot market sales price per ton of \$575, and average contract business sales price per ton of \$611. The average spot price used in the forecast considers further announced price increases, recognizing, among other things, the timing and the extent such increases are expected to become effective. The benefit of the increase in sales prices from the Business Plan is essentially offset by the substantial increase in production costs, and in particular in raw material costs, primarily scrap and coke, as well as higher working capital levels and a higher loan balance outstanding on the CIT credit facility as of January 2004.

I accept that this is generally a cancel out or wash in all material respects.

33 I note that \$145 million of cash resources had been used from January 1, 2003 to the date of filing. Use of the credit facility of \$350 million had increased from \$241 million on November 30, 2003 to \$293 million on the date of filing. There must be a reasonable reserve of liquidity to take into account day to day, week to week or month to month variances and also provide for unforeseen circumstances such as the breakdown of a piece of vital equipment which would significantly affect production until remedied. Trade credit had been contracting as a result of appreciation by suppliers of Stelco's financial difficulties. The DIP financing of \$75 million is only available if Stelco is under CCAA protection. I also note that a shut down as a result of running out of liquidity would be complicated in the case of Stelco and that even if conditions turned around more than reasonably expected, start-up costs would be heavy and quite importantly, there would be a significant erosion of the customer base (reference should be had to the Slater Hamilton plant in this regard). One does not liquidate assets which one would not sell

in the ordinary course of business to thereby artificially salvage some liquidity for the purpose of the test: see *Pacific Mobile Corp., Re* (1979), 32 C.B.R. (N.S.) 209 (C.S. Que.) at p. 220. As a rough test, I note that Stelco (albeit on a consolidated basis with all subsidiaries) running significantly behind plan in 2003 from its budget of a profit of \$80 million now to a projected loss of \$192 million and cash has gone from a positive \$209 million to a negative \$114 million.

34 Locker made the observation at paragraph 8 of his affidavit that:

8. Stelco has performed poorly for the past few years primarily due to an inadequate business strategy, poor utilization of assets, inefficient operations and generally weak management leadership and decision-making. This point is best supported by the fact that Stelco's local competitor, Dofasco, has generated outstanding results in the same period.

Table 1 to his affidavit would demonstrate that Dofasco has had superior profitability and cashflow performance than its "neighbour" Stelco. He went on to observe at paragraphs 36-37:

36. Stelco can achieve significant cost reductions through means other than cutting wages, pensions and benefits for employees and retirees. Stelco could bring its cost levels down to those of restructured U.S. mills, with the potential for lowering them below those of many U.S. mills.

37. Stelco could achieve substantial savings through productivity improvements within the mechanisms of the current collective agreements. More importantly, a major portion of this cost reduction could be achieved through constructive negotiations with the USWA in an out-of-court restructuring that does not require intervention of the courts through the vehicle of CCAA protection.

I accept his constructive comments that there is room for cost reductions and that there are substantial savings to be achieved through productivity improvements. However, I do not see anything detrimental to these discussions and negotiations by having them conducted within the umbrella of a CCAA proceeding. See my comments above regarding the CCAA in practice.

35 But I would observe and I am mystified by Locker's observations at paragraph 12 (quoted above), that Stelco should have borrowed to fund pension obligations to avoid its current financial crisis. This presumes that the borrowed funds would not constitute an obligation to be paid back as to principal and interest, but rather that it would assume the character of a cost-free "gift".

36 I note that Mackey, without the "laundry list" he indicates at paragraph 17 of his second affidavit, is unable to determine at paragraph 19 (for himself) whether Stelco was insolvent. Mackey was unable to avail himself of all available information in light of the Union's refusal to enter into a confidentiality agreement. He does not closely adhere to the BIA tests as they are defined. In the face of positive evidence about an applicant's financial position by an experienced person with expertise, it is not sufficient to displace this evidence by filing evidence which goes no further than raising questions: see *Anvil Range Mining Corp., supra* at p. 162.

37 The Union referred me to one of my decisions *Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co.* (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 7 (Ont. Gen. Div.) where I stated as to the MacGirr affidavit:

The Trustee's cause of action is premised on MacGirr's opinion that STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 and therefore the STC common shares and promissory note received by Trustco in return for the Injection had no value at the time the Injection was made. Further, MacGirr ascribed no value to the opportunity which the Injection gave to Trustco to restore STC and salvage its thought to be existing \$74 million investment. In stating his opinion MacGirr defined solvency as:

- (a) the ability to meet liabilities as they fall due; and
- (b) that assets exceed liabilities.

On cross-examination MacGirr testified that in his opinion on either test STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 since as to (a) STC was experiencing then a negative cash flow and as to (b) the STC financial statements incorrectly reflected

values. As far as (a) is concerned, I would comment that while I concur with MacGirr that at some time in the long run a company that is experiencing a negative cash flow will eventually not be able to meet liabilities as they fall due but that is not the test (which is a "present exercise"). On that current basis STC was meeting its liabilities on a timely basis.

38 As will be seen from that expanded quote, MacGirr gave his own definitions of insolvency which are not the same as the s. 2 BIA tests (a), (b) and (c) but only a very loose paraphrase of (a) and (c) and an omission of (b). Nor was I referred to the *King Petroleum Ltd.* or *Proulx* cases *supra*. Further, it is obvious from the context that "*sometime in the long run . . . eventually*" is not a finite time in the foreseeable future.

39 I have not given any benefit to the \$313 - \$363 million of improvements referred to in the affidavit of William Vaughan at paragraph 115 as those appear to be capital expenditures which will have to be accommodated within a plan of arrangement or after emergence.

40 It seems to me that if the BIA (a) test is restrictively dealt with (as per my question to Union counsel as to how far in the future should one look on a prospective basis being answered "24 hours") then Stelco would not be insolvent under that test. However, I am of the view that that would be unduly restrictive and a proper contextual and purposive interpretation to be given when it is being used for a restructuring purpose even under BIA would be to see whether there is a reasonably foreseeable (at the time of filing) expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis which will result in the applicant running out of "cash" to pay its debts as they generally become due in the future without the benefit of the say and ancillary protection and procedure by court authorization pursuant to an order. I think this is the more appropriate interpretation of BIA (a) test in the context of a reorganization or "rescue" as opposed to a threshold to bankruptcy consideration or a fraudulent preferences proceeding. On that basis, I would find Stelco insolvent from the date of filing. Even if one were not to give the latter interpretation to the BIA (a) test, clearly for the above reasons and analysis, if one looks at the meaning of "insolvent" within the context of a CCAA reorganization or rescue solely, then of necessity, the time horizon must be such that the liquidity crisis would occur in the sense of running out of "cash" but for the grant of the CCAA order. On that basis Stelco is certainly insolvent given its limited cash resources unused, its need for a cushion, its rate of cash burn recently experienced and anticipated.

41 What about the BIA (c) test which may be roughly referred to as an assets compared with obligations test. See *New Quebec Raglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen*, [1993] O.J. No. 727 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) as to fair value and fair market valuation. The Union observed that there was no intention by Stelco to wind itself up or proceed with a sale of some or all of its assets and undertaking and therefore some of the liabilities which Stelco and Stephen took into account would not crystallize. However, as I discussed at the time of the hearing, the (c) test is what one might reasonably call or describe as an "artificial" or notional/hypothetical test. It presumes certain things which are in fact not necessarily contemplated to take place or to be involved. In that respect, I appreciate that it may be difficult to get one's mind around that concept and down the right avenue of that (c) test. See my views at trial in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*, [2001] O.J. No. 3394 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paragraphs 13, 21 and 33; affirmed [2003] O.J. No. 5242 (Ont. C.A.). At paragraph 33, I observed in closing:

33 . . . They (and their expert witnesses) all had to contend with dealing with rambling and complicated facts and, in Section 100 BIA, a section which is difficult to administer when fmv [fair market value] in a notational or hypothetical market involves ignoring what would often be regarded as self evidence truths but at the same time appreciating that this notational or hypothetical market requires that the objects being sold have to have realistic true to life attributes recognized.

42 The Court of Appeal stated at paragraphs 24-25 as follows:

24. Nor are the appellants correct to argue that the trial judge also assumed an imprudent vendor in arriving at his conclusion about the fair market value of the OYSF note would have to know that in order to realize value from the note any purchaser would immediately put OYSF and thus OYDL itself into bankruptcy to pre-empt a subsequent triggering event in favour of EIB. While this was so, and the trial judge clearly understood it, the error in this submission is that it seeks to inject into the analysis factors subjected to the circumstances of OYDL as vendor and

not intrinsic to the value of the OYSF note. The calculation of fair market value does not permit this but rather must assume an unconstrained vendor.

25. The Applicants further argue that the trial judge eroded in determining the fair market value of the OYSF note by reference to a transaction which was entirely speculative because it was never considered by OYDL nor would have it been since it would have resulted in OYDL's own bankruptcy. I disagree. The transaction hypothesized by the trial judge was one between a notational, willing, prudent and informed vendor and purchaser based on factors relevant to the OYSF note itself rather than the particular circumstances of OYDL as the seller of the note. This is an entirely appropriate way to determine the fair market value of the OYSF note.

43 Test (c) deems a person to be insolvent if "the aggregate of [its] property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or of disposed at a fairly conducted sale under legal process would not be sufficient to enable payment of all [its] obligations, due and accruing due." The origins of this legislative test appear to be the decision of Spragge V-C in *Davidson v. Douglas* (1868), 15 Gr. 347 (Ont. Ch.) at p. 351 where he stated with respect to the solvency or insolvency of a debtor, the proper course is:

to see and examine whether all his property, real and personal, be sufficient if presently realized for the payment of his debts, and in this view we must estimate his land, as well as his chattel property, not at what his neighbours or others may consider to be its value, but at what it would bring in the market at a forced sale, or a sale where the seller cannot await his opportunities, but must sell.

44 In *Clarkson v. Sterling* (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Ont. C.P.) at p. 463, Rose J. indicted that the sale must be fair and reasonable, but that the determination of fairness and reasonableness would depend on the facts of each case.

45 The Union essentially relied on garnishment cases. Because of the provisions relating as to which debts may or may not be garnished, these authorities are of somewhat limited value when dealing with the test (c) question. However I would refer to one of the Union's cases *Bank of Montreal v. I.M. Krisp Foods Ltd.*, [1996] S.J. No. 655 (Sask. C.A.) where it is stated at paragraph 11:

11. Few phrases have been as problematic to define as "debt due or accruing due". The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed. defines "accruing" as "arising in due course", but an examination of English and Canadian authority reveals that not all debts "arising in due course" are permitted to be garnished. (See Professor Dunlop's extensive research for his British Columbia Law Reform Commission's Report on Attachment of Debts Act, 1978 at 17 to 29 and its text Creditor-Debtor Law in Canada, 2nd ed. at 374 to 385.)

46 In *Barsi v. Farcas* (1923), [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154 (Sask. C.A.), Lamont J.A. was cited for his statement at p. 522 of *Webb v. Stenton* (1883), 11 Q.B.D. 518 (Eng. C.A.) that: "an accruing debt, therefore, is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation."

47 Saunders J. noted in *633746 Ontario Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 72 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 81 that a sale out of the ordinary course of business would have an adverse effect on that actually realized.

48 There was no suggestion by any of the parties that any of the assets and undertaking would have any enhanced value from that shown on the financial statements prepared according to GAAP.

49 In *King Petroleum Ltd.*, *supra* at p. 81 Steele J. observed:

To consider the question of insolvency under cl. (c) I must look to the aggregate property of the company and come to a conclusion as to whether or not it would be sufficient to enable payment of all obligations due and accruing due. There are two tests to be applied: First, its fair value and, secondly, its value if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process. The balance sheet is a starting point, but the evidence relating to the fair value of the assets and what they might realize if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process must be reviewed in interpreting it. In this case, I find

no difficulty in accepting the obligations shown as liabilities because they are known. I have more difficulty with respect to the assets.

50 To my view the preferable interpretation to be given to "sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due" is to be determined in the context of this test as a whole. What is being put up to satisfy those obligations is the debtor's assets and undertaking *in total*; in other words, the debtor in essence is taken as having sold everything. There would be no residual assets and undertaking to pay off any obligations which would not be encompassed by the phrase "all of his obligations, due and accruing due". Surely, there cannot be "orphan" obligations which are left hanging unsatisfied. It seems to me that the intention of "due and accruing due" was to cover off all obligations of whatever nature or kind and leave nothing in limbo.

51 S. 121(1) and (2) of the BIA, which are incorporated by reference in s. 12 of the CCAA, provide in respect to provable claims:

S. 121(1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt's discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The determination whether a contingent or unliquidated claim is a provable claim and the valuation of such claim shall be made in accordance with s. 135.

52 *Houlden and Morawetz 2004 Annotated supra* at p. 537 (G28(3)) indicates:

The word "liability" is a very broad one. It includes all obligations to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which he becomes bankrupt except for contingent and unliquidated claims which are dealt with in s. 121(2).

However contingent and unliquidated claims would be encompassed by the term "obligations".

53 In *Gardner v. Newton (1916)*, 29 D.L.R. 276 (Man. K.B.), Mathers C.J.K.B. observed at p. 281 that "contingent claim, that is, a claim which may or may not ripen into a debt, according as some future event does or does not happen." See *A Debtor (No. 64 of 1992)*, Re, [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Eng. Ch. Div.) at p. 268 for the definition of a "liquidated sum" which is an amount which can be readily ascertained and hence by corollary an "unliquidated claim" would be one which is not easily ascertained, but will have to be valued. In *Gagnier, Re (1950)*, 30 C.B.R. 74 (Ont. S.C.), there appears to be a conflation of not only the (a) test with the (c) test, but also the invocation of the judicial discretion not to grant the receiving order pursuant to a bankruptcy petition, notwithstanding that "[the judge was] unable to find the debtor is bankrupt". The debtor was able to survive the (a) test as he had the practice (accepted by all his suppliers) of providing them with post dated cheques. The (c) test was not a problem since the judge found that his assets should be valued at considerably more than his obligations. However, this case does illustrate that the application of the tests present some difficulties. These difficulties are magnified when one is dealing with something more significantly complex and a great deal larger than a haberdashery store - in the case before us, a giant corporation in which, amongst other things, is engaged in a very competitive history including competition from foreign sources which have recently restructured into more cost efficient structures, having shed certain of their obligations. As well, that is without taking into account that a sale would entail significant transaction costs. Even of greater significance would be the severance and termination payments to employees not continued by the new purchaser. Lastly, it was recognized by everyone at the hearing that Stelco's plants, especially the Hamilton-Hilton works, have extremely high environmental liabilities lurking in the woodwork. Stephen observed that these obligations would be substantial, although not quantified.

54 It is true that there are no appraisals of the plant and equipment nor of the assets and undertaking of Stelco. Given the circumstances of this case and the complexities of the market, one may realistically question whether or not the appraisals would be all that helpful or accurate.

55 I would further observe that in the notional or hypothetical exercise of a sale, then all the obligations which would be triggered by such sale would have to be taken into account.

56 All liabilities, contingent or unliquidated would have to be taken into account. See *King Petroleum Ltd.*, *supra* p. 81; *Salvati*, *supra* pp. 80-1; *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisioners Maritimes Ltd.* (1989), 45 B.L.R. 14 (N.S. T.D.) at p. 29; *Challmie, Re* (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78 (B.C. S.C.), at pp. 81-2. In *Challmie* the debtor ought to have known that his guarantee was very much exposed given the perilous state of his company whose liabilities he had guaranteed. It is interesting to note what was stated in *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of)*, even if it is rather patently obvious. Tidman J. said in respect of the branch of the company at p. 29:

Mr. MacAdam argues also that the \$4.8 million employees' severance obligation was not a liability on January 20, 1986. The *Bankruptcy Act* includes as obligations both those due and accruing due. Although the employees' severance obligation was not due and payable on January 20, 1986 it was an obligation "accruing due". The Toronto facility had experienced severe financial difficulties for some time; in fact, it was the major, if not the sole cause, of Maybank's financial difficulties. I believe it is reasonable to conclude that a reasonably astute perspective buyer of the company has a going concern would have considered that obligation on January 20, 1986 and that it would have substantially reduced the price offered by that perspective buyer. Therefore that obligation must be considered as an obligation of the company on January 20, 1986.

57 With the greatest of respect for my colleague, I disagree with the conclusion of Ground J. in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc.*, *supra* as to the approach to be taken to "due and accruing due" when he observed at pp. 139-140:

It therefore becomes necessary to determine whether the principle amount of the Notes constitutes an obligation "due or accruing due" as of the date of this application.

There is a paucity of helpful authority on the meaning of "accruing due" for purposes of a definition of insolvency. Historically, in 1933, in *P. Lyall & Sons Construction Co. v. Baker*, [1933] O.R. 286 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal, in determining a question of set-off under the *Dominion Winding-Up Act* had to determine whether the amount claimed as set-off was a debt due or accruing due to the company in liquidation for purposes of that Act. Marsten J. at pp. 292-293 quoted from Moss J.A. in *Mail Printing Co. v. Clarkson* (1898), 25 O.R. 1 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 8:

A debt is defined to be a sum of money which is certainly, and at all event, payable without regard to the fact whether it be payable now or at a future time. And an accruing debt is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation: Per Lindley L.J. in *Webb v. Stenton* (1883), 11 Q.D.D. at p. 529.

Whatever relevance such definition may have had for purposes of dealing with claims by and against companies in liquidation under the old winding-up legislation, it is apparent to me that it should not be applied to definitions of insolvency. To include every debt payable at some future date in "accruing due" for the purposes of insolvency tests would render numerous corporations, with long term debt due over a period of years in the future and anticipated to be paid out of future income, "insolvent" for the purposes of the BIA and therefore the CCAA. For the same reason, I do not accept the statement quoted in the Enterprise factum from the decision of the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York in *Centennial Textiles Inc., Re*, 220 B.R. 165 (U.S.N.Y.D.C. 1998) that "if the present saleable value of assets are less than the amount required to pay existing debt as they mature, the debtor is insolvent". In my view, the obligations, which are to be measured against the fair valuation of a company's property as being obligations due and accruing due, must be limited to obligations currently payable or properly chargeable to the accounting period during which the test is being applied as, for example, a sinking fund payment due within the current year. Black's Law Dictionary defines "accrued liability" as "an obligation or debt which is properly chargeable in a given accounting period, but which is not yet paid or payable". The principal amount of the Notes is neither due nor accruing due in this sense.

58 There appears to be some confusion in this analysis as to "debts" and "obligations", the latter being much broader than debts. Please see above as to my views concerning the floodgates argument under the BIA and CCAA being addressed by judicially exercised discretion even if "otherwise warranted" applications were made. I pause to note that an insolvency test under general corporate litigation need not be and likely is not identical, or indeed similar to that under these insolvency statutes. As well, it is curious to note that the cut off date is the end of the current fiscal period which could have radically different

results if there were a calendar fiscal year and the application was variously made in the first week of January, mid-summer or the last day of December. Lastly, see above and below as to my views concerning the proper interpretation of this question of "accruing due".

59 It seems to me that the phrase "accruing due" has been interpreted by the courts as broadly identifying obligations that will "become due". See *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* below at pp. 163-4 - at least at some point in the future. Again, I would refer to my conclusion above that *every obligation* of the corporation in the hypothetical or notional sale must be treated as "accruing due" to avoid orphan obligations. In that context, it matters not that a wind-up pension liability may be discharged over 15 years; in a test (c) situation, it is crystallized on the date of the test. See *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc. supra* at pp. 756-7; *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re (1986)*, 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C. S.C.) at pp. 164-63-4; *Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd., Re (1986)*, 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 163. In *Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd.*, Spencer J. at pp. 162-3 stated:

In my opinion, a futures broker is not in that special position. The third definition of "insolvency" may apply to a futures trader at any time even though he has open long positions in the market. Even though Consolidated's long positions were not required to be closed on 10th December, the chance that they might show a profit by March 1981 or even on the following day and thus wipe out Consolidated's cash deficit cannot save it from a condition of insolvency on that day. The circumstances fit precisely within the third definition; if all Consolidated's assets had been sold on that day at a fair value, the proceeds would not have covered its obligations due and accruing due, including its obligations to pay in March 1981 for its long positions in rapeseed. The market prices from day to day establish a fair valuation. . . .

The contract to buy grain at a fixed price at a future time imposes a present obligation upon a trader taking a long position in the futures market to take delivery in exchange for payment at that future time. It is true that in the practice of the market, that obligation is nearly always washed out by buying an offsetting short contract, but until that is done the obligation stands. The trader does not know who will eventually be on the opposite side of his transaction if it is not offset but all transactions are treated as if the clearing house is on the other side. It is a present obligation due at a future time. It is therefore an obligation accruing due within the meaning of the third definition of "insolvency".

60 The possibility of an expectancy of future profits or a change in the market is not sufficient; *Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd.* at p. 162 emphasizes that the test is to be done on that day, the day of filing in the case of an application for reorganization.

61 I see no objection to using Exhibit C to Stephen's affidavit as an aid to review the balance sheet approach to test (c). While Stephen may not have known who prepared Exhibit C, he addressed each of its components in the text of his affidavit and as such he could have mechanically prepared the exhibit himself. He was comfortable with and agreed with each of its components. Stelco's factum at paragraphs 70-1 submits as follows:

70. In Exhibit C to his Affidavit, Mr. Stephen addresses a variety of adjustments to the Shareholder's Equity of Stelco necessary to reflect the values of assets and liabilities as would be required to determine whether Stelco met the test of insolvency under Clause C. In cross examination of both Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Stephen only one of these adjustments was challenged - the "Possible Reductions in Capital Assets."

71. The basis of the challenge was that the comparative sales analysis was flawed. In the submission of Stelco, none of these challenges has any merit. Even if the entire adjustment relating to the value in capital assets is ignored, the remaining adjustments leave Stelco with assets worth over \$600 million less than the value of its obligations due and accruing due. This fundamental fact is not challenged.

62 Stelco went on at paragraphs 74-5 of its factum to submit:

74. The values relied upon by Mr. Stephen if anything, understate the extent of Stelco's insolvency. As Mr. Stephen has stated, and no one has challenged by affidavit evidence or on cross examination, in a fairly conducted sale under legal process, the value of Stelco's working capital and other assets would be further impaired by: (i) increased environmental liabilities not reflected on the financial statements, (ii) increased pension deficiencies that would be

generated on a wind up of the pension plans, (iii) severance and termination claims and (iv) substantial liquidation costs that would be incurred in connection with such a sale.

75. No one on behalf of the USWA has presented any evidence that the capital assets of Stelco are in excess of book value on a stand alone basis. Certainly no one has suggested that these assets would be in excess of book value if the related environmental legacy costs and collective agreements could not be separated from the assets.

63 Before turning to that exercise, I would also observe that test (c) is also disjunctive. There is an insolvency condition if the total obligation of the debtor exceed either (i) a fair valuation of its assets or (ii) the proceeds of a sale fairly conducted under legal process of its assets.

64 As discussed above and confirmed by Stephen, if there were a sale under legal process, then it would be unlikely, especially in this circumstance that values would be enhanced; in all probability they would be depressed from book value. Stephen took the balance sheet GAAP calculated figure of equity at November 30, 2003 as \$804.2 million. From that, he deducted the loss for December 2003 - January 2004 of \$17 million to arrive at an equity position of \$787.2 million as at the date of filing.

65 From that, he deducted, reasonably in my view, those "booked" assets that would have no value in a test (c) sale namely: (a) \$294 million of future income tax recourse which would need taxable income in the future to realize; (b) \$57 million for a write-off of the Platemill which is presently hot idled (while Locker observed that it would not be prohibitive in cost to restart production, I note that neither Stephen nor Vaughn were cross examined as to the decision not to do so); and (c) the capitalized deferred debt issue expense of \$3.2 million which is being written off over time and therefore, truly is a "nothing". This totals \$354.2 million so that the excess of value over liabilities before reflecting obligations not included in the financials directly, but which are, substantiated as to category in the notes would be \$433 million.

66 On a windup basis, there would be a pension deficiency of \$1252 million; however, Stephen conservatively in my view looked at the Mercer actuary calculations on the basis of a going concern finding deficiency of \$656 million. If the \$1252 million windup figure had been taken, then the picture would have been even bleaker than it is as Stephen has calculated it for test (c) purposes. In addition, there are deferred pension costs of \$198.7 million which under GAAP accounting calculations is allowed so as to defer recognition of past bad investment experience, but this has no realizable value. Then there is the question of Employee Future Benefits. These have been calculated as at December 31, 2003 by the Mercer actuary as \$909.3 million but only \$684 million has been accrued and booked on the financial statements so that there has to be an increased provision of \$225.3 million. These off balance sheet adjustments total \$1080 million.

67 Taking that last adjustment into account would result in a *negative* equity of (\$433 million minus \$1080 million) or *negative* \$647 million. On that basis without taking into account possible reductions in capital assets as dealt with in the somewhat flawed Exhibit E nor environmental and other costs discussed above, Stelco is insolvent according to the test (c). With respect to Exhibit E, I have not relied on it in any way, but it is entirely likely that a properly calculated Exhibit E would provide comparators (also being sold in the U.S. under legal process in a fairly conducted process) which tend to require a further downward adjustment. Based on test (c), Stelco is significantly, not marginally, under water.

68 In reaching my conclusion as to the negative equity (and I find that Stephen approached that exercise fairly and constructively), please note my comments above regarding the possible assumption of pension obligations by the purchaser being offset by a reduction of the purchase price. The 35% adjustment advocated as to pension and employee benefits in this regard is speculation by the Union. Secondly, the Union emphasized cash flow as being important in evaluation, but it must be remembered that Stelco has been negative cash flow for some time which would make that analysis unreliable and to the detriment of the Union's position. The Union treated the \$773 million estimated contribution to the shortfall in the pension deficiency by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund as eliminating that as a Stelco obligation. That is not the case however as that Fund would be subrogated to the claims of the employees in that respect with a result that Stelco would remain liable for that \$773 million. Lastly, the Union indicated that there should be a \$155 million adjustment as to the negative equity in Sub Applicants when calculating Stelco's equity. While Stephen at Q. 181-2 acknowledged that there was no adjustment for

that, I agree with him that there ought not to be since Stelco was being examined (and the calculations were based) on an unconsolidated basis, not on a consolidated basis.

69 In the end result, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that Stelco is insolvent and therefore it is a "debtor company" as at the date of filing and entitled to apply for the CCAA initial order. My conclusion is that (i) BIA test (c) strongly shows Stelco is insolvent; (ii) BIA test (a) demonstrates, to a less certain but sufficient basis, an insolvency and (iii) the "new" CCAA test again strongly supports the conclusion of insolvency. I am further of the opinion that I properly exercised my discretion in granting Stelco and the Sub Applicants the initial order on January 29, 2004 and I would confirm that as of the present date with effect on the date of filing. The Union's motion is therefore dismissed.

70 I appreciate that all the employees (union and non-union alike) and the Union and the International have a justifiable pride in their work and their workplace - and a human concern about what the future holds for them. The pensioners are in the same position. Their respective positions can only be improved by engaging in discussion, an exchange of views and information reasonably advanced and conscientiously listened to and digested, leading to mutual problem solving, ideas and negotiations. Negative attitudes can only lead to the detriment to all stakeholders. Unfortunately there has been some finger pointing on various sides; that should be put behind everyone so that participants in this process can concentrate on the future and not inappropriately dwell on the past. I understand that there have been some discussions and interchange over the past two weeks since the hearing and that is a positive start.

Motion dismissed.

APPENDIX

TAB D

2014 ONSC 494

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Jaguar Mining Inc., Re

2013 CarswellOnt 18630, 2014 ONSC 494, 12 C.B.R. (6th) 290, 236 A.C.W.S. (3d) 820

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Jaguar Mining Inc., Applicant

Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: December 23, 2013

Judgment: December 23, 2013

Written reasons: January 16, 2014

Docket: CV-13-10383-00CL

Counsel: Tony Reyes, Evan Cobb for Applicant, Jaguar Mining Inc.
Robert J. Chadwick, Caroline Descours for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Joseph Bellissimo for Secured Lender, Global Resource Fund
Jeremy Dacks for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Robin B. Schwill for Special Committee of the Board of Directors

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.viii Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Miscellaneous
Effect of stay on subsidiaries — Debtor company was holding company for gold mining business Debtor brought application
for protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) for itself and subsidiaries Application granted — Debtor wished
to affect recapitalization — Recapitalization was supported by 93 per cent of noteholders, which formed bulk of debt — Debtor
was insolvent and facing liquidity crisis — Extending stay to subsidiaries was reasonable as debtor was dependant on them
for income — Director's charge granted .

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Morawetz J.:

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187, 2006 ABQB 153, 2006 CarswellAlta 446 (Alta. Q.B.) —
referred to

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC
222 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div.
[Commercial List]) — referred to

SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re (2013), 2013 CarswellOnt 2785, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial
List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 10(2) — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 22(2) — considered

APPLICATION by debtor for protection under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J. (orally):

1 On December 23, 2013, I heard the CCAA application of Jaguar Mining Inc. ("Jaguar") and made the following three endorsements:

1. CCAA protection granted. Initial Order signed. Reasons will follow. It is expected that parties will utilize the e-Service Protocol which can be confirmed on comeback motion. Sealing Order of confidential exhibits granted.

2. Meeting Order granted in form submitted.

3. Claims Procedure Order granted in form submitted.

2 These are my reasons.

3 Jaguar sought protection from its creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and requested authorization to commence a process for the approval and implementation of a plan of compromise and arrangement affecting its unsecured creditors.

4 Jaguar also requested certain protections in favour of its wholly-owned subsidiaries that are not applicants (the "Subsidiaries" and, together with the Applicant, the "Jaguar Group").

5 Counsel to Jaguar submits that the principal objective of these proceedings is to effect a recapitalization and financing transaction (the "Recapitalization") on an expedited basis through a plan of compromise and arrangement (the "Plan") to provide a financial foundation for the Jaguar Group going forward and additional liquidity to allow the Jaguar Group to continue to work towards its operational and financial goals. The Recapitalization, if implemented, is expected to result in a reduction of over \$268 million of debt and new liquidity upon exit of approximately \$50 million.

6 Jaguar's senior unsecured convertible notes (the "Notes") are the primary liabilities affected by the Recapitalization. Any other affected liabilities of Jaguar, which is a holding company with no active business operations, are limited and identifiable.

7 The Recapitalization is supported by an Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders of the Notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders") and other Consenting Noteholders, who collectively represent approximately 93% of the Notes.

8 The background facts are set out in the affidavit of David M. Petrov sworn December 23, 2013 (the "Petrov Affidavit"), the important points of which are summarized below.

9 Jaguar is a corporation existing under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. B.16, with a registered office in Toronto, Ontario. Jaguar has assets in Canada.

10 Jaguar is the public parent corporation of other corporations in the Jaguar Group that carry on active gold mining and exploration in Brazil, employing in excess of 1,000 people. Jaguar itself does not carry on active gold mining operations.

11 Jaguar has three wholly-owned Brazilian operating subsidiaries: MCT Mineração Ltda. ("MCT"), Mineração Serras do Oeste Ltda. ("MSOL") and Mineração Turmalina Ltda. ("MTL") (and, together with MCT and MSOL, the "Subsidiaries"), all incorporated in Brazil.

12 The Subsidiaries' assets include properties in the development stage and in the production stage.

13 Jaguar has been the main corporate vehicle through which financing has been raised for the operations of the Jaguar Group. The Subsidiaries have guaranteed repayment of certain funds borrowed by Jaguar.

14 Jaguar has raised debt financing by (a) issuing notes, and (b) borrowing from Renvest Mercantile Bank Corp. Inc., through its global resource fund ("Renvest").

15 In aggregate, Jaguar has issued a principal amount of \$268.5 million of Notes through two transactions, known as the "2014 Notes" and the "2016 Notes".

16 Interest is paid semi-annually on the 2014 Notes and the 2016 Notes. Jaguar has not paid the last interest payment due on November 1, 2013. Under the 2014 Notes, the grace period has lapsed and an event of default has occurred.

17 Jaguar is also the borrower under a fully drawn \$30 million secured facility (the "Renvest Facility") with Renvest. The obligations under the Renvest Facility are secured by a general security agreement from Jaguar as well as guarantees and collateral security granted by each of the Subsidiaries.

18 Jaguar has identified another potential liability. Mr. Daniel Titcomb, former chief executive officer of Jaguar, and certain other associated parties, have instituted a legal proceeding against Jaguar and certain of its current and former directors that is currently proceeding in the United States Federal Court. Counsel to Jaguar submits that this lawsuit alleges certain employment-related claims and other claims in respect of equity interests in Jaguar that are held by Mr. Titcomb and others. Counsel to Jaguar advises that Jaguar and its board of directors believe this lawsuit to be without merit.

19 Counsel also advises that, aside from the lawsuit and professional service fees incurred by Jaguar, the unsecured liabilities of Jaguar are not material.

20 The Jaguar Group's mines are not low-cost gold producers and the recent decline in the price of gold has negatively impacted the Jaguar Group.

21 Based on current world prices and Jaguar Group's current level of expenditures, the Jaguar Group is expected to cease to have sufficient cash resources to continue operations early in the first quarter of 2014.

22 Counsel also submits that, as a result of Jaguar's event of default under the 2014 Notes, certain remedies have become available, including the possible acceleration of the principal amount and accrued and unpaid interest on the 2014 Notes. As of November 13, 2013, that principal and accrued interest totalled approximately \$169.3 million.

23 Jaguar's unaudited consolidated financial statements for the nine months ending September 30, 2013 show that Jaguar had an accumulated deficit of over \$317 million and a net loss of over \$82 million for the nine months ending September 30, 2013. Jaguar's current liabilities (at book value) exceed Jaguar's current assets (at book value) by approximately \$40 million.

24 I accept that Jaguar faces a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

25 Jaguar has been involved in a strategic review over the past two years. Counsel submits that the efforts of Jaguar and its advisors have shown that a comprehensive restructuring plan involving a debt-to-equity exchange and an investment of new money is the best available alternative to address Jaguar's financial issues.

26 Counsel to Jaguar advises that the board of directors of Jaguar has determined that the Recapitalization is the best available option to Jaguar and, further, that the plan cannot be implemented outside of a CCAA proceeding. Counsel emphasizes that without the protection of the CCAA, Jaguar is exposed to the immediate risk that enforcement steps may be taken under a variety of debt instruments. Further, Jaguar is not in a position to satisfy obligations that may result from such enforcement steps.

27 Jaguar requests a stay of proceedings in favour of non-applicant Subsidiaries contending that, because of Jaguar's dependence upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity, the commencement of any proceedings or the exercise of rights or remedies against these Subsidiaries would be detrimental to Jaguar's restructuring efforts and would undermine a process that would otherwise benefit Jaguar Group's stakeholders as a whole.

28 Jaguar also seeks a charge on its current and future assets (the "Property") in the maximum amount of \$5 million (a \$500,000 first-ranking charge (the "Primary Administration Charge") and a \$4.5 million fourth-ranking charge (the "Subordinated Administration Charge") (together, the "Administration Charge")). The purpose of the charge is to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered both before and after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings by various professionals, as well as Canaccord Genuity and Houlihan Lokey, as financial advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee (collectively, the "Financial Advisors").

29 Counsel advises that the Financial Advisors' monthly work fees (but not their success fees) will be secured by the Primary Administration Charge, while the Financial Advisors' success fees will be secured solely by the Subordinated Administration Charge.

30 Counsel further advises that the Proposed Initial Order contemplates the establishment of a charge on Jaguar's Property in the amount of \$150,000 (the "Director's Charge") to protect the directors and officers. Counsel further advises that the benefit of the Director's Charge will only be available to the extent that a liability is not covered by existing directors and officers insurance. The directors and officers have indicated that, due to the potential for personal liability, they may not continue their service in this restructuring unless the Initial Order grants the Director's Charge.

31 Counsel to Jaguar further advises that the proposed monitor is of the view that the Director's Charge and the Administration Charge are reasonable in these circumstances.

32 Jaguar is unaware of any secured creditors, other than those who have received notice of the application, who are likely to be affected by the court-ordered charges.

33 In addition to the Initial Order, Jaguar also seeks a Claims Procedure Order and a Meeting Order, submitting that it must complete the Recapitalization on an expedited timeline.

34 Each of the Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order include a comeback provision.

35 Having reviewed the record and upon hearing submissions, I am satisfied the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies. It is insolvent and faces a looming liquidity crisis. The Applicant is subject to claims in excess of \$5 million and has assets in Canada. I am also satisfied that the application is properly before me as the Applicant's registered office and certain of its assets are situated in Toronto, Ontario.

36 I am also satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the obligations of s. 10(2) of the CCAA.

37 I am also satisfied that an extension of the stay of proceedings to the Subsidiaries of Jaguar is appropriate in the circumstances. Further, I am also satisfied that it is reasonable and appropriate to grant the Administration Charge and the Director's Charge over the Property of the Applicant. In these circumstances, I am also prepared to approve the Engagement Letters and to seal the terms of the Engagement Letters. In deciding on the sealing provision, I have taken into account that the Engagement Letters contain sensitive commercial information, the disclosure of which could be harmful to the parties at issue. However, as I indicated at the hearing, this issue should be revisited at the comeback hearing.

38 I am also satisfied that Jaguar should be authorized to comply with the pre-filing obligations to the extent provided in the Initial Order.

39 In arriving at the foregoing conclusions, I reviewed the argument submitted by counsel to Jaguar that the stay of proceedings against non-applicants is appropriate. The Jaguar Group operates in a fully integrated manner and depends upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity. Absent a stay of proceedings not only in favour of Jaguar but also in favour of the Subsidiaries, various creditors would be in a position to take enforcement steps which could conceivably lead to a failed restructuring, which would not be in the best interests of Jaguar's stakeholders.

40 The court has jurisdiction to extend the stay in favour of Jaguar's Subsidiaries. See *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2006 ABQB 153, 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.); *SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

41 The authority to grant the court-ordered Administration Charge and Director's Charge is contained in ss. 11.51 and 11.52 of the CCAA.

42 In granting the Administration Charge, I am satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate; and
- (iii) the charges should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

43 In considering both the amount of the Administration Charge and who should be entitled to its benefit, the following factors can also be considered:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured; and
- (b) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles.

See *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

44 In this case, the proposed restructuring involves the proposed beneficiaries of the charge. I accept that many have played a significant role in the negotiation of the Recapitalization to date and will continue to play a role in the implementation of the Recapitalization. I am satisfied that there is no unwarranted duplication of roles among those who benefit from the proposed Administration Charge.

45 With respect to the Director's Charge, the court must be satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate;
- (iii) the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost; and
- (iv) the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

46 A review of the evidence satisfies me that it is appropriate to grant the Director's Charge as requested.

47 Jaguar requested that the Initial Order authorize it to perform certain pre-filing obligations in respect of professional service providers and third parties who provide services in respect of Jaguar's public listing agreement. In the circumstances, I find it to be reasonable that Jaguar be authorized to perform these pre-filing obligations.

48 In view of Jaguar's desire to move quickly to implement the Recapitalization, I have also been persuaded that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant the Claims Procedure Order and the Meeting Order at this time. These are procedural steps in the CCAA process and do not require any assessment by the court as to the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan at this stage.

49 Counsel to Jaguar submits that Jaguar's approach to classification of the affected unsecured creditors is appropriate in these circumstances, citing a commonality of interest. Counsel also references s. 22(2) of the CCAA. For the purposes of today's motion, I am prepared to accept this argument. However, this is an issue that can, if raised, be reviewed at the comeback hearing.

50 In the result, an Initial Order is granted together with a Meeting Order and Claims Procedure Order. All orders have been signed in the form presented.

Application granted.

TAB E

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [Arrangement de MPECO Construction inc.](#) | 2019 QCCS 297, 2019 CarswellQue 730, EYB 2019-306949, 67 C.B.R. (6th) 87 | (Que. Bkcty., Feb 4, 2019)

2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60

Supreme Court of Canada

Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re

2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 533, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 534, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, 196 A.C.W.S. (3d) 27, 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 409 N.R. 201, 503 W.A.C. 1, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, J.E. 2011-5

Century Services Inc. (Appellant) and Attorney General of Canada on behalf of Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada (Respondent)

Deschamps J., McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ.

Heard: May 11, 2010

Judgment: December 16, 2010

Docket: 33239

Proceedings: reversing [Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re \(2009\)](#), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.), 2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.); reversing [Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re \(2008\)](#), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, 2009 G.T.C. 2011 (Eng.) (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])

Counsel: Mary I.A. Buttery, Owen J. James, Matthew J.G. Curtis for Appellant
Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk, Michael J. Lema for Respondent

Subject: Estates and Trusts; Goods and Services Tax (GST); Tax — Miscellaneous; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Tax

I General principles

1.7 Tax claims in bankruptcy proceedings

Tax

III Goods and Services Tax [GST] and Harmonized Sales Tax [HST]

III.12 Collection and remittance

III.12.b GST/HST held in trust

Headnote

Tax --- Goods and Services Tax — Collection and remittance — GST held in trust

Debtor owed Crown under [Excise Tax Act \(ETA\)](#) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of [ETA](#) and [CCAA](#) yielded conclusion that [CCAA](#) provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under [CCAA](#) when it amended [ETA](#) in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both [CCAA](#) and [Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#), and neither statute

provided for preferred treatment of GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No "gap" should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown — Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, ss. 222(1), (1.1).

Tax --- General principles — Priority of tax claims in bankruptcy proceedings

Debtor owed Crown under Excise Tax Act (ETA) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of ETA and CCAA yielded conclusion that CCAA provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under CCAA when it amended ETA in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), and neither statute provided for preferred treatment of GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No "gap" should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown.

Taxation --- Taxe sur les produits et services — Perception et versement — Montant de TPS détenu en fiducie

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyaient que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Taxation --- Principes généraux — Priorité des créances fiscales dans le cadre de procédures en faillite

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyait que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

The debtor company owed the Crown under the [Excise Tax Act \(ETA\)](#) for GST that was not remitted. The debtor commenced proceedings under the [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#). Under an order by the B.C. Supreme Court, the amount of the tax debt was placed in a trust account, and the remaining proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets were paid to the major secured creditor. The debtor's application for a partial lifting of the stay of proceedings in order to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while the Crown's application for the immediate payment of the unremitted GST was dismissed.

The Crown's appeal to the B.C. Court of Appeal was allowed. The Court of Appeal found that the lower court was bound by the [ETA](#) to give the Crown priority once bankruptcy was inevitable. The Court of Appeal ruled that there was a deemed trust under [s. 222 of the ETA](#) or that an express trust was created in the Crown's favour by the court order segregating the GST funds in the trust account.

The creditor appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Held: The appeal was allowed.

Per Deschamps J. (McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ. concurring): A purposive and contextual analysis of the [ETA](#) and [CCAA](#) yielded the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the [CCAA](#) when it amended the [ETA](#) in 2000. Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law under both the [CCAA](#) and [Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#). Unlike for source deductions, there was no express statutory basis in the [CCAA](#) or [BIA](#) for concluding that GST claims enjoyed any preferential treatment. The internal logic of the [CCAA](#) also militated against upholding a deemed trust for GST claims.

Giving the Crown priority over GST claims during [CCAA](#) proceedings but not in bankruptcy would, in practice, deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive [CCAA](#) regime. It seemed likely that Parliament had inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly, which could be resolved by giving precedence to [s. 18.3 of the CCAA](#). [Section 222\(3\) of the ETA](#) could no longer be seen as having impliedly repealed [s. 18.3 of the CCAA](#) by being passed subsequently to the [CCAA](#), given the recent amendments to the [CCAA](#). The legislative context supported the conclusion that [s. 222\(3\) of the ETA](#) was not intended to narrow the scope of [s. 18.3 of the CCAA](#).

The breadth of the court's discretion under the [CCAA](#) was sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the [BIA](#), so there was authority under the [CCAA](#) to partially lift the stay of proceedings to allow the debtor's entry into liquidation. There should be no gap between the [CCAA](#) and [BIA](#) proceedings that would invite a race to the courthouse to assert priorities.

The court order did not have the certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary of the funds sufficient to support an express trust, as the funds were segregated until the dispute between the creditor and the Crown could be resolved. The amount

collected in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada was not subject to a deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of the Crown.

Per Fish J. (concurring): Parliament had declined to amend the provisions at issue after detailed consideration of the insolvency regime, so the apparent conflict between s. 18.3 of the CCAA and s. 222 of the ETA should not be treated as a drafting anomaly. In the insolvency context, a deemed trust would exist only when two complementary elements co-existed: first, a statutory provision creating the trust; and second, a CCAA or BIA provision confirming its effective operation. Parliament had created the Crown's deemed trust in the Income Tax Act, Canada Pension Plan and Employment Insurance Act and then confirmed in clear and unmistakable terms its continued operation under both the CCAA and the BIA regimes. In contrast, the ETA created a deemed trust in favour of the Crown, purportedly notwithstanding any contrary legislation, but Parliament did not expressly provide for its continued operation in either the BIA or the CCAA. The absence of this confirmation reflected Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings. Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings, and so s. 222 of the ETA mentioned the BIA so as to exclude it from its ambit, rather than include it as the other statutes did. As none of these statutes mentioned the CCAA expressly, the specific reference to the BIA had no bearing on the interaction with the CCAA. It was the confirmatory provisions in the insolvency statutes that would determine whether a given deemed trust would subsist during insolvency proceedings.

Per Abella J. (dissenting): The appellate court properly found that s. 222(3) of the ETA gave priority during CCAA proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. The failure to exempt the CCAA from the operation of this provision was a reflection of clear legislative intent. Despite the requests of various constituencies and case law confirming that the ETA took precedence over the CCAA, there was no responsive legislative revision and the BIA remained the only exempted statute. There was no policy justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention and, in any event, the application of other principles of interpretation reinforced this conclusion. Contrary to the majority's view, the "later in time" principle did not favour the precedence of the CCAA, as the CCAA was merely re-enacted without significant substantive changes. According to the Interpretation Act, in such circumstances, s. 222(3) of the ETA remained the later provision. The chambers judge was required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the ETA and so did not have the authority to deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the CCAA proceedings.

La compagnie débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA). La débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC). En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs de la débitrice a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal. La demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement immédiat des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée.

L'appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli. La Cour d'appel a conclu que le tribunal se devait, en vertu de la LTA, de donner priorité à la Couronne une fois la faillite inévitable. La Cour d'appel a estimé que l'art. 222 de la LTA établissait une fiducie présumée ou bien que l'ordonnance du tribunal à l'effet que les montants de TPS soient détenus dans un compte en fiducie créait une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Le créancier a formé un pourvoi.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été accueilli.

Deschamps, J. (McLachlin, J.C.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell, JJ., souscrivant à son opinion) : Une analyse téléologique et contextuelle de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000. Le législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne dans le cadre du droit de l'insolvabilité, sous le régime de la LACC et celui de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI). Contrairement aux retenues à la source, aucune disposition législative expresse ne permettait de conclure que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la LACC ou celui de la LFI. La logique interne de la LACC allait également à l'encontre du maintien de la fiducie réputée à l'égard des créances découlant de la TPS.

Le fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet, dans les faits, de priver les compagnies de la possibilité de se restructurer

sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC. Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle, laquelle pouvait être corrigée en donnant préséance à l'art. 18.3 de la LACC. On ne pouvait plus considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC parce qu'il avait été adopté après la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC. Le contexte législatif étayait la conclusion suivant laquelle l'art. 222(3) de la LTA n'avait pas pour but de restreindre la portée de l'art. 18.3 de la LACC.

L'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la LACC était suffisant pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI, de sorte qu'il avait, en vertu de la LACC, le pouvoir de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation. Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse, puisque les fonds étaient détenus à part jusqu'à ce que le litige entre le créancier et la Couronne soit résolu. Le montant perçu au titre de la TPS mais non encore versé au receveur général du Canada ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Fish, J. (souscrivant aux motifs des juges majoritaires) : Le législateur a refusé de modifier les dispositions en question suivant un examen approfondi du régime d'insolvabilité, de sorte qu'on ne devrait pas qualifier l'apparente contradiction entre l'art. 18.3 de la LACC et l'art. 222 de la LTA d'anomalie rédactionnelle. Dans un contexte d'insolvabilité, on ne pourrait conclure à l'existence d'une fiducie présumée que lorsque deux éléments complémentaires étaient réunis : en premier lieu, une disposition législative qui crée la fiducie et, en second lieu, une disposition de la LACC ou de la LFI qui confirme l'existence de la fiducie. Le législateur a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne dans la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu, le Régime de pensions du Canada et la Loi sur l'assurance-emploi puis, il a confirmé en termes clairs et explicites sa volonté de voir cette fiducie présumée produire ses effets sous le régime de la LACC et de la LFI. Dans le cas de la LTA, il a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne, sciemment et sans égard pour toute législation à l'effet contraire, mais n'a pas expressément prévu le maintien en vigueur de celle-ci sous le régime de la LFI ou celui de la LACC. L'absence d'une telle confirmation témoignait de l'intention du législateur de laisser la fiducie présumée devenir caduque au moment de l'introduction de la procédure d'insolvabilité. L'intention du législateur était manifestement de rendre inopérantes les fiducies présumées visant la TPS dès l'introduction d'une procédure d'insolvabilité et, par conséquent, l'art. 222 de la LTA mentionnait la LFI de manière à l'exclure de son champ d'application, et non de l'y inclure, comme le faisaient les autres lois. Puisqu'aucune de ces lois ne mentionnait spécifiquement la LACC, la mention explicite de la LFI n'avait aucune incidence sur l'interaction avec la LACC. C'était les dispositions confirmatoires que l'on trouvait dans les lois sur l'insolvabilité qui déterminaient si une fiducie présumée continuerait d'exister durant une procédure d'insolvabilité.

Abella, J. (dissidente) : La Cour d'appel a conclu à bon droit que l'art. 222(3) de la LTA donnait préséance à la fiducie présumée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS non versée. Le fait que la LACC n'ait pas été soustraite à l'application de cette disposition témoignait d'une intention claire du législateur. Malgré les demandes répétées de divers groupes et la jurisprudence ayant confirmé que la LTA l'emportait sur la LACC, le législateur n'est pas intervenu et la LFI est demeurée la seule loi soustraite à l'application de cette disposition. Il n'y avait pas de considération de politique générale qui justifierait d'aller à l'encontre, par voie d'interprétation législative, de l'intention aussi clairement exprimée par le législateur et, de toutes manières, cette conclusion était renforcée par l'application d'autres principes d'interprétation. Contrairement à l'opinion des juges majoritaires, le principe de la préséance de la « loi postérieure » ne militait pas en faveur de la préséance de la LACC, celle-ci ayant été simplement adoptée à nouveau sans que l'on ne lui ait apporté de modifications importantes. En vertu de la Loi d'interprétation, dans ces circonstances, l'art. 222(3) de la LTA demeurait la disposition postérieure. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet était tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi à l'art. 222(3) de la LTA, et il ne pouvait pas refuser la demande présentée par la Couronne en vue de se faire payer la TPS dans le cadre de la procédure introduite en vertu de la LACC.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Deschamps J.*:

- Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173, 2003 CarswellOnt 2464 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Air Canada, Re (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re (2009), (sub nom. *Dep. Min. Rev. Quebec v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) 2009 G.T.C. 2036 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, 312 D.L.R. (4th) 577, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154, (sub nom. *9083-4185 Québec Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 394 N.R. 368, 60 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 2009 SCC 49, 2009 CarswellQue 10706, 2009 CarswellQue 10707 (S.C.C.) — referred to

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re (2000), [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re (2000), 2000 CarswellOnt 3269, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité) (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — distinguished

Dylex Ltd., Re (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 1995 CarswellOnt 54 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue (2002), [2002] 3 C.T.C. 285, (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver Finance*) 2002 D.T.C. 6998 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver Finance*) 2002 D.T.C. 7007 (Fr.), 288 N.R. 347, 212 D.L.R. (4th) 615, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2003] 1 W.W.R. 1, 45 C.B.R. (4th) 213, 2002 SCC 49, 2002 CarswellSask 317, 2002 CarswellSask 318, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.) — considered

Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re (2003), 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, 2003 ABQB 894, 2003 CarswellAlta 1735, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 49 C.B.R. (4th) 213, [2004] 10 W.W.R. 180, 352 A.R. 28 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Ivaco Inc., Re (2006), 2006 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8218, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 176, 83 O.R. (3d) 108, 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132, 2006 CarswellOnt 6292, 56 C.C.P.B. 1, 26 B.L.R. (4th) 43 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Komunik Corp., Re (2010), 2010 CarswellQue 686, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.) — referred to

Komunik Corp., Re (2009), 2009 QCCS 6332, 2009 CarswellQue 13962 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed

Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re (1992), 72 B.C.L.R. (2d) 368, 19 B.C.A.C. 134, 34 W.A.C. 134, 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265, 1992 CarswellBC 524 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 67 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 142, 1992 CarswellBC 542 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville (1979), (sub nom. *Bourgeault, Re*) 33 C.B.R. (N.S.) 301, (sub nom. *Bourgeault's Estate v. Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue)*) 30 N.R. 24, (sub nom. *Bourgeault, Re*) 105 D.L.R. (3d) 270, 1979 CarswellQue 165, 1979 CarswellQue 266, (sub nom. *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) v. Bourgeault (Trustee of)*) [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada) (1934), [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, 1934 CarswellNat 1, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp. (1997), 193 A.R. 321, 135 W.A.C. 321, [1997] 2 W.W.R. 457, 208 N.R. 161, 12 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 68, 1997 CarswellAlta 112, 1997 CarswellAlta 113, 46 Alta. L.R. (3d) 87, (sub nom. *R. v. Royal Bank*) 97 D.T.C. 5089, 143 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 44 C.B.R. (3d) 1, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.) — considered

Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re (2003), 2003 CarswellBC 1399, 2003 BCCA 344, 184 B.C.A.C. 54, 302 W.A.C. 54, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Skydome Corp., Re (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Solid Resources Ltd., Re (2002), [2003] G.S.T.C. 21, 2002 CarswellAlta 1699, 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144, 1999 CarswellBC 2673 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])

— referred to

United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re (2000), 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, 221 W.A.C. 96, 2000 CarswellBC 414, 73 B.C.L.R. (3d) 236, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141, [2000] 5 W.W.R. 178 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Cases considered by Fish J.:

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed

Cases considered by Abella J. (dissenting):

Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board) (1977), [1977] 2 F.C. 663, 14 N.R. 257, 74 D.L.R. (3d) 307, 1977 CarswellNat 62, 1977 CarswellNat 62F (Fed. C.A.) — referred to

Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité) (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

R. v. Tele-Mobile Co. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 1588, 2008 CarswellOnt 1589, 2008 SCC 12, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 372 N.R. 157, 55 C.R. (6th) 1, (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 229 C.C.C. (3d) 417, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 235 O.A.C. 369, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, (sub nom. *R. v. Tele-Mobile Company (Telus Mobility)*) 92 O.R. (3d) 478 (note), (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 291 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (S.C.C.) — considered

Statutes considered by Deschamps J.:

Bank Act, S.C. 1991, c. 46

Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — referred to

s. 67(3) — referred to

s. 81.1 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 81.2 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 86(1) — considered

s. 86(3) — referred to

Bankruptcy Act and to amend the Income Tax Act in consequence thereof, Act to amend the, S.C. 1992, c. 27

Generally — referred to

s. 39 — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, Act to amend the, S.C. 1997, c. 12

s. 73 — referred to

s. 125 — referred to

s. 126 — referred to

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23(3) — referred to

s. 23(4) — referred to

Cités et villes, Loi sur les, L.R.Q., c. C-19

en général — referred to

Code civil du Québec, L.Q. 1991, c. 64

en général — referred to

art. 2930 — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, Act to Amend, S.C. 1952-53, c. 3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — referred to

s. 11(4) — referred to

s. 11(6) — referred to

s. 11.02 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.09 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 18.3 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

s. 18.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 20 — considered

s. 21 — considered

s. 37 — considered

s. 37(1) — referred to

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to
Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — referred to

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered
Fairness for the Self-Employed Act, S.C. 2009, c. 33

Generally — referred to

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

s. 227(4) — referred to

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — referred to
Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 44(f) — considered

Personal Property Security Act, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05

Generally — referred to

Sales Tax and Excise Tax Amendments Act, 1999, S.C. 2000, c. 30

Generally — referred to

Wage Earner Protection Program Act, S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 1

Generally — referred to

s. 69 — referred to

s. 128 — referred to

s. 131 — referred to

Statutes considered *Fish J.*:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — considered

s. 67(3) — considered

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23 — considered

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to
Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3)(a) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

Generally — referred to

s. 227(4) — considered

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

s. 227(4.1)(a) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

Statutes considered *Abella J.* (dissenting):

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 2(1)"enactment" — considered

s. 44(f) — considered

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Generally — referred to

APPEAL by creditor from judgment reported at 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.) (B.C. C.A.), allowing Crown's appeal from dismissal of application for immediate payment of tax debt.

Deschamps J.:

1 For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). In that respect, two questions are raised. The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the *CCAA* and not the *ETA* that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the *CCAA* and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*"). I would allow the appeal.

1. Facts and Decisions of the Courts Below

2 Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. ("LeRoy Trucking") commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on December 13, 2007, obtaining a stay of proceedings with a view to reorganizing its financial affairs. LeRoy Trucking sold certain redundant assets as authorized by the order.

3 Amongst the debts owed by LeRoy Trucking was an amount for Goods and Services Tax ("GST") collected but unremitted to the Crown. The *ETA* creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown for amounts collected in respect of GST. The deemed trust extends to any property or proceeds held by the person collecting GST and any property of that person held by a secured creditor, requiring that property to be paid to the Crown in priority to all security interests. The *ETA* provides that the deemed trust operates despite any other enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. However, the *CCAA* also provides that subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentions GST, deemed trusts in favour of the Crown do not operate under the *CCAA*. Accordingly, under the *CCAA* the Crown ranks as an unsecured creditor in respect of GST. Nonetheless, at the time LeRoy Trucking commenced *CCAA* proceedings the leading line of jurisprudence held that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA* such that the Crown enjoyed priority for GST claims under the *CCAA*, even though it would have lost that same priority under the *BIA*. The *CCAA* underwent substantial amendments in 2005 in which some of the provisions at issue in this appeal were renumbered and reformulated (S.C. 2005, c. 47). However, these amendments only came into force on September 18, 2009. I will refer to the amended provisions only where relevant.

4 On April 29, 2008, Brenner C.J.S.C., in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings, approved a payment not exceeding \$5 million, the proceeds of redundant asset sales, to Century Services, the debtor's major secured creditor. LeRoy Trucking proposed to hold back an amount equal to the GST monies collected but unremitted to the Crown and place it in the Monitor's trust account until the outcome of the reorganization was known. In order to maintain the *status quo* while the success of the reorganization was uncertain, Brenner C.J.S.C. agreed to the proposal and ordered that an amount of \$305,202.30 be held by the Monitor in its trust account.

5 On September 3, 2008, having concluded that reorganization was not possible, LeRoy Trucking sought leave to make an assignment in bankruptcy under the *BIA*. The Crown sought an order that the GST monies held by the Monitor be paid to the Receiver General of Canada. Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the latter application. Reasoning that the purpose of segregating the funds with the Monitor was "to facilitate an ultimate payment of the GST monies which were owed pre-filing, but only if a viable plan emerged", the failure of such a reorganization, followed by an assignment in bankruptcy, meant the Crown would lose priority under the *BIA* (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

6 The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 270 B.C.A.C. 167 (B.C. C.A.)). Tysse J.A. for a unanimous court found two independent bases for allowing the Crown's appeal.

7 First, the court's authority under s. 11 of the *CCAA* was held not to extend to staying the Crown's application for immediate payment of the GST funds subject to the deemed trust after it was clear that reorganization efforts had failed and that bankruptcy was inevitable. As restructuring was no longer a possibility, staying the Crown's claim to the GST funds no longer served a

purpose under the *CCAA* and the court was bound under the priority scheme provided by the *ETA* to allow payment to the Crown. In so holding, Tysoe J.A. adopted the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)*, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.), which found that the *ETA* deemed trust for GST established Crown priority over secured creditors under the *CCAA*.

8 Second, Tysoe J.A. concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account on April 29, 2008, the judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown from which the monies in question could not be diverted for any other purposes. The Court of Appeal therefore ordered that the money held by the Monitor in trust be paid to the Receiver General.

2. Issues

9 This appeal raises three broad issues which are addressed in turn:

(1) Did s. 222(3) of the *ETA* displace s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* and give priority to the Crown's *ETA* deemed trust during *CCAA* proceedings as held in *Ottawa Senators*?

(2) Did the court exceed its *CCAA* authority by lifting the stay to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy?

(3) Did the court's order of April 29, 2008 requiring segregation of the Crown's GST claim in the Monitor's trust account create an express trust in favour of the Crown in respect of those funds?

3. Analysis

10 The first issue concerns Crown priorities in the context of insolvency. As will be seen, the *ETA* provides for a deemed trust in favour of the Crown in respect of GST owed by a debtor "[d]espite ... any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)" (s. 222(3)), while the *CCAA* stated at the relevant time that "notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be [so] regarded" (s. 18.3(1)). It is difficult to imagine two statutory provisions more apparently in conflict. However, as is often the case, the apparent conflict can be resolved through interpretation.

11 In order to properly interpret the provisions, it is necessary to examine the history of the *CCAA*, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by Parliament, and the principles that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. It will be seen that Crown priorities in the insolvency context have been significantly pared down. The resolution of the second issue is also rooted in the context of the *CCAA*, but its purpose and the manner in which it has been interpreted in the case law are also key. After examining the first two issues in this case, I will address Tysoe J.A.'s conclusion that an express trust in favour of the Crown was created by the court's order of April 29, 2008.

3.1 Purpose and Scope of Insolvency Law

12 Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors' enforcement actions and attempt to obtain a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.

13 Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute — it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails, the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.

14 Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below, the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

15 As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* — Canada's first reorganization statute — is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.

16 Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36), practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), at p. 12). The battering visited upon Canadian businesses by the Great Depression and the absence of an effective mechanism for reaching a compromise between debtors and creditors to avoid liquidation required a legislative response. The *CCAA* was innovative as it allowed the insolvent debtor to attempt reorganization under judicial supervision outside the existing insolvency legislation which, once engaged, almost invariably resulted in liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.), at pp. 660-61; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 12-13).

17 Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected — notably creditors and employees — and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

18 Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the *CCAA*'s remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation (S. E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587, at p. 592). Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs (*ibid.*, at p. 593). Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.

19 The *CCAA* fell into disuse during the next several decades, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds (S.C. 1952-53, c. 3). During the economic downturn of the early 1980s, insolvency lawyers and courts adapting to the resulting wave of insolvencies resurrected the statute and deployed it in response to new economic challenges. Participants in insolvency proceedings grew to recognize and appreciate the statute's distinguishing feature: a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the *CCAA*'s objectives. The manner in which courts have used *CCAA* jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways is explored in greater detail below.

20 Efforts to evolve insolvency law were not restricted to the courts during this period. In 1970, a government-commissioned panel produced an extensive study recommending sweeping reform but Parliament failed to act (see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation* (1970)). Another panel of experts produced more

limited recommendations in 1986 which eventually resulted in enactment of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of 1992 (S.C. 1992, c. 27) (see *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)). Broader provisions for reorganizing insolvent debtors were then included in Canada's bankruptcy statute. Although the 1970 and 1986 reports made no specific recommendations with respect to the *CCAA*, the House of Commons committee studying the *BIA*'s predecessor bill, C-22, seemed to accept expert testimony that the *BIA*'s new reorganization scheme would shortly supplant the *CCAA*, which could then be repealed, with commercial insolvency and bankruptcy being governed by a single statute (*Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, October 3, 1991, at pp. 15:15-15:16).

21 In retrospect, this conclusion by the House of Commons committee was out of step with reality. It overlooked the renewed vitality the *CCAA* enjoyed in contemporary practice and the advantage that a flexible judicially supervised reorganization process presented in the face of increasingly complex reorganizations, when compared to the stricter rules-based scheme contained in the *BIA*. The "flexibility of the *CCAA* [was seen as] a great benefit, allowing for creative and effective decisions" (Industry Canada, Marketplace Framework Policy Branch, *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2002), at p. 41). Over the past three decades, resurrection of the *CCAA* has thus been the mainspring of a process through which, one author concludes, "the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world" (R. B. Jones, "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 481).

22 While insolvency proceedings may be governed by different statutory schemes, they share some commonalities. The most prominent of these is the single proceeding model. The nature and purpose of the single proceeding model are described by Professor Wood in *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*:

They all provide a collective proceeding that supersedes the usual civil process available to creditors to enforce their claims. The creditors' remedies are collectivized in order to prevent the free-for-all that would otherwise prevail if creditors were permitted to exercise their remedies. In the absence of a collective process, each creditor is armed with the knowledge that if they do not strike hard and swift to seize the debtor's assets, they will be beat out by other creditors. [pp. 2-3]

The single proceeding model avoids the inefficiency and chaos that would attend insolvency if each creditor initiated proceedings to recover its debt. Grouping all possible actions against the debtor into a single proceeding controlled in a single forum facilitates negotiation with creditors because it places them all on an equal footing, rather than exposing them to the risk that a more aggressive creditor will realize its claims against the debtor's limited assets while the other creditors attempt a compromise. With a view to achieving that purpose, both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* allow a court to order all actions against a debtor to be stayed while a compromise is sought.

23 Another point of convergence of the *CCAA* and the *BIA* relates to priorities. Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. In addition, one of the important features of legislative reform of both statutes since the enactment of the *BIA* in 1992 has been a cutback in Crown priorities (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, ss. 73 and 125; S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 148; S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69 and 131; S.C. 2009, c. 33, ss. 25 and 29; see also *Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154 (S.C.C.); *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville* (1979), [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.); *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)).

24 With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation (see *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 19).

25 Mindful of the historical background of the *CCAA* and *BIA*, I now turn to the first question at issue.

3.2 GST Deemed Trust Under the CCAA

26 The Court of Appeal proceeded on the basis that the *ETA* precluded the court from staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust when partially lifting the stay to allow the debtor to enter bankruptcy. In so doing, it adopted the reasoning in a line of cases culminating in *Ottawa Senators*, which held that an *ETA* deemed trust remains enforceable during *CCAA* reorganization despite language in the *CCAA* that suggests otherwise.

27 The Crown relies heavily on the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* and argues that the later in time provision of the *ETA* creating the GST deemed trust trumps the provision of the *CCAA* purporting to nullify most statutory deemed trusts. The Court of Appeal in this case accepted this reasoning but not all provincial courts follow it (see, e.g., *Komunik Corp., Re*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (C.S. Que.), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.)). Century Services relied, in its written submissions to this Court, on the argument that the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay against the Crown's claim for unremitted GST. In oral argument, the question of whether *Ottawa Senators* was correctly decided nonetheless arose. After the hearing, the parties were asked to make further written submissions on this point. As appears evident from the reasons of my colleague Abella J., this issue has become prominent before this Court. In those circumstances, this Court needs to determine the correctness of the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators*.

28 The policy backdrop to this question involves the Crown's priority as a creditor in insolvency situations which, as I mentioned above, has evolved considerably. Prior to the 1990s, Crown claims largely enjoyed priority in insolvency. This was widely seen as unsatisfactory as shown by both the 1970 and 1986 insolvency reform proposals, which recommended that Crown claims receive no preferential treatment. A closely related matter was whether the *CCAA* was binding at all upon the Crown. Amendments to the *CCAA* in 1997 confirmed that it did indeed bind the Crown (see *CCAA*, s. 21, as am. by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 126).

29 Claims of priority by the state in insolvency situations receive different treatment across jurisdictions worldwide. For example, in Germany and Australia, the state is given no priority at all, while the state enjoys wide priority in the United States and France (see B. K. Morgan, "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bank. L.J.* 461, at p. 500). Canada adopted a middle course through legislative reform of Crown priority initiated in 1992. The Crown retained priority for source deductions of income tax, Employment Insurance ("EI") and Canada Pension Plan ("CPP") premiums, but ranks as an ordinary unsecured creditor for most other claims.

30 Parliament has frequently enacted statutory mechanisms to secure Crown claims and permit their enforcement. The two most common are statutory deemed trusts and powers to garnish funds third parties owe the debtor (see F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (loose-leaf), at § 2).

31 With respect to GST collected, Parliament has enacted a deemed trust. The *ETA* states that every person who collects an amount on account of GST is deemed to hold that amount in trust for the Crown (s. 222(1)). The deemed trust extends to other property of the person collecting the tax equal in value to the amount deemed to be in trust if that amount has not been remitted in accordance with the *ETA*. The deemed trust also extends to property held by a secured creditor that, but for the security interest, would be property of the person collecting the tax (s. 222(3)).

32 Parliament has created similar deemed trusts using almost identical language in respect of source deductions of income tax, EI premiums and CPP premiums (see s. 227(4) of the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*"), ss. 86(2) and (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, and ss. 23(3) and (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8). I will refer to income tax, EI and CPP deductions as "source deductions".

33 In *Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.), this Court addressed a priority dispute between a deemed trust for source deductions under the *ITA* and security interests taken under both the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46, and the *Alberta Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05 ("*PPSA*"). As then worded, an *ITA* deemed trust over the debtor's

property equivalent to the amount owing in respect of income tax became effective at the time of liquidation, receivership, or assignment in bankruptcy. *Sparrow Electric* held that the *ITA* deemed trust could not prevail over the security interests because, being fixed charges, the latter attached as soon as the debtor acquired rights in the property such that the *ITA* deemed trust had no property on which to attach when it subsequently arose. Later, in *First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.), this Court observed that Parliament had legislated to strengthen the statutory deemed trust in the *ITA* by deeming it to operate from the moment the deductions were not paid to the Crown as required by the *ITA*, and by granting the Crown priority over all security interests (paras. 27-29) (the "*Sparrow Electric* amendment").

34 The amended text of s. 227(4.1) of the *ITA* and concordant source deductions deemed trusts in the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* state that the deemed trust operates notwithstanding any other enactment of Canada, except ss. 81.1 and 81.2 of the *BIA*. The *ETA* deemed trust at issue in this case is similarly worded, but it excepts the *BIA* in its entirety. The provision reads as follows:

222. (3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

35 The Crown submits that the *Sparrow Electric* amendment, added by Parliament to the *ETA* in 2000, was intended to preserve the Crown's priority over collected GST under the *CCAA* while subordinating the Crown to the status of an unsecured creditor in respect of GST only under the *BIA*. This is because the *ETA* provides that the GST deemed trust is effective "despite" any other enactment except the *BIA*.

36 The language used in the *ETA* for the GST deemed trust creates an apparent conflict with the *CCAA*, which provides that subject to certain exceptions, property deemed by statute to be held in trust for the Crown shall not be so regarded.

37 Through a 1997 amendment to the *CCAA* (S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 125), Parliament appears to have, subject to specific exceptions, nullified deemed trusts in favour of the Crown once reorganization proceedings are commenced under the Act. The relevant provision reads:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

This nullification of deemed trusts was continued in further amendments to the *CCAA* (S.C. 2005, c. 47), where s. 18.3(1) was renumbered and reformulated as s. 37(1):

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

38 An analogous provision exists in the *BIA*, which, subject to the same specific exceptions, nullifies statutory deemed trusts and makes property of the bankrupt that would otherwise be subject to a deemed trust part of the debtor's estate and available to creditors (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 73; *BIA*, s. 67(2)). It is noteworthy that in both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, the exceptions concern source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.3(2); *BIA*, s. 67(3)). The relevant provision of the *CCAA* reads:

18.3 (2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*....

Thus, the Crown's deemed trust and corresponding priority in source deductions remain effective both in reorganization and in bankruptcy.

39 Meanwhile, in both s. 18.4(1) of the *CCAA* and s. 86(1) of the *BIA*, other Crown claims are treated as unsecured. These provisions, establishing the Crown's status as an unsecured creditor, explicitly exempt statutory deemed trusts in source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.4(3); *BIA*, s. 86(3)). The *CCAA* provision reads as follows:

18.4 (3) Subsection (1) [Crown ranking as unsecured creditor] does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution

Therefore, not only does the *CCAA* provide that Crown claims do not enjoy priority over the claims of other creditors (s. 18.3(1)), but the exceptions to this rule (i.e., that Crown priority is maintained for source deductions) are repeatedly stated in the statute.

40 The apparent conflict in this case is whether the rule in the *CCAA* first enacted as s. 18.3 in 1997, which provides that subject to certain explicit exceptions, statutory deemed trusts are ineffective under the *CCAA*, is overridden by the one in the *ETA* enacted in 2000 stating that GST deemed trusts operate despite any enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. With respect for my colleague Fish J., I do not think the apparent conflict can be resolved by denying it and creating a rule requiring both a statutory provision enacting the deemed trust, and a second statutory provision confirming it. Such a rule is unknown to the law. Courts must recognize conflicts, apparent or real, and resolve them when possible.

41 A line of jurisprudence across Canada has resolved the apparent conflict in favour of the *ETA*, thereby maintaining GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA*. *Ottawa Senators*, the leading case, decided the matter by invoking the doctrine of implied repeal to hold that the later in time provision of the *ETA* should take precedence over the *CCAA* (see also *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219, [2003] G.S.T.C. 21 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlet*

42 The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* rested its conclusion on two considerations. First, it was persuaded that by explicitly mentioning the *BIA* in *ETA* s. 222(3), but not the *CCAA*, Parliament made a deliberate choice. In the words of MacPherson J.A.:

The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

43 Second, the Ontario Court of Appeal compared the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* to that before this Court in *Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.), and found them to be "identical" (para. 46). It therefore considered *Doré* binding (para. 49). In *Doré*, a limitations provision in the more general and recently enacted *Civil Code of Québec*, S.Q. 1991, c. 64 ("C.C.Q."), was held to have repealed a more specific provision of the earlier Quebec *Cities and Towns Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-19, with which it conflicted. By analogy, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the later in time and more general provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, impliedly repealed the more specific and earlier in time provision, s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (paras. 47-49).

44 Viewing this issue in its entire context, several considerations lead me to conclude that neither the reasoning nor the result in *Ottawa Senators* can stand. While a conflict may exist at the level of the statutes' wording, a purposive and contextual analysis to determine Parliament's true intent yields the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the *CCAA* when it amended the *ETA* in 2000 with the *Sparrow Electric* amendment.

45 I begin by recalling that Parliament has shown its willingness to move away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (subject to the s. 18.3(2) exceptions) provides that the Crown's deemed trusts have no effect under the *CCAA*. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and

intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so explicitly and elaborately. For example, s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and s. 67(3) of the *BIA* expressly provide that deemed trusts for source deductions remain effective in insolvency. Parliament has, therefore, clearly carved out exceptions from the general rule that deemed trusts are ineffective in insolvency. The *CCAA* and *BIA* are in harmony, preserving deemed trusts and asserting Crown priority only in respect of source deductions. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. Unlike source deductions, which are clearly and expressly dealt with under both these insolvency statutes, no such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

46 The internal logic of the *CCAA* also militates against upholding the *ETA* deemed trust for GST. The *CCAA* imposes limits on a suspension by the court of the Crown's rights in respect of source deductions but does not mention the *ETA* (s. 11.4). Since source deductions deemed trusts are granted explicit protection under the *CCAA*, it would be inconsistent to afford a better protection to the *ETA* deemed trust absent explicit language in the *CCAA*. Thus, the logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject the *ETA* deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority (s. 18.4).

47 Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert.

48 Arguably, the effect of *Ottawa Senators* is mitigated if restructuring is attempted under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, but it is not cured. If *Ottawa Senators* were to be followed, Crown priority over GST would differ depending on whether restructuring took place under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The anomaly of this result is made manifest by the fact that it would deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive *CCAA* regime, which has been the statute of choice for complex reorganizations.

49 Evidence that Parliament intended different treatments for GST claims in reorganization and bankruptcy is scant, if it exists at all. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted as part of a wide-ranging budget implementation bill in 2000. The summary accompanying that bill does not indicate that Parliament intended to elevate Crown priority over GST claims under the *CCAA* to the same or a higher level than source deductions claims. Indeed, the summary for deemed trusts states only that amendments to existing provisions are aimed at "ensuring that employment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan contributions that are required to be remitted by an employer are fully recoverable by the Crown in the case of the bankruptcy of the employer" (Summary to *S.C. 2000, c. 30*, at p. 4a). The wording of GST deemed trusts resembles that of statutory deemed trusts for source deductions and incorporates the same overriding language and reference to the *BIA*. However, as noted above, Parliament's express intent is that only source deductions deemed trusts remain operative. An exception for the *BIA* in the statutory language establishing the source deductions deemed trusts accomplishes very little, because the explicit language of the *BIA* itself (and the *CCAA*) carves out these source deductions deemed trusts and maintains their effect. It is however noteworthy that no equivalent language maintaining GST deemed trusts exists under either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*.

50 It seems more likely that by adopting the same language for creating GST deemed trusts in the *ETA* as it did for deemed trusts for source deductions, and by overlooking the inclusion of an exception for the *CCAA* alongside the *BIA* in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, Parliament may have inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly. Because of a statutory lacuna in the *ETA*, the GST deemed trust could be seen as remaining effective in the *CCAA*, while ceasing to have any effect under the *BIA*, thus creating an apparent conflict with the wording of the *CCAA*. However, it should be seen for what it is: a facial conflict only, capable of resolution by looking at the broader approach taken to Crown priorities and by giving precedence to the statutory language of s. 18.3 of the *CCAA* in a manner that does not produce an anomalous outcome.

51 Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. It merely creates an apparent conflict that must be resolved by statutory interpretation. Parliament's intent when it enacted *ETA* s. 222(3) was therefore far

from unambiguous. Had it sought to give the Crown a priority for GST claims, it could have done so explicitly as it did for source deductions. Instead, one is left to infer from the language of *ETA s. 222(3)* that the GST deemed trust was intended to be effective under the *CCAA*.

52 I am not persuaded that the reasoning in *Doré* requires the application of the doctrine of implied repeal in the circumstances of this case. The main issue in *Doré* concerned the impact of the adoption of the *C.C.Q.* on the administrative law rules with respect to municipalities. While Gonthier J. concluded in that case that the limitation provision in art. 2930 *C.C.Q.* had repealed by implication a limitation provision in the *Cities and Towns Act*, he did so on the basis of more than a textual analysis. The conclusion in *Doré* was reached after thorough contextual analysis of both pieces of legislation, including an extensive review of the relevant legislative history (paras. 31-41). Consequently, the circumstances before this Court in *Doré* are far from "identical" to those in the present case, in terms of text, context and legislative history. Accordingly, *Doré* cannot be said to require the automatic application of the rule of repeal by implication.

53 A noteworthy indicator of Parliament's overall intent is the fact that in subsequent amendments it has not displaced the rule set out in the *CCAA*. Indeed, as indicated above, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in the rule previously found in s. 18.3 being renumbered and reformulated as s. 37. Thus, to the extent the interpretation allowing the GST deemed trust to remain effective under the *CCAA* depends on *ETA s. 222(3)* having impliedly repealed *CCAA s. 18.3(1)* because it is later in time, we have come full circle. Parliament has renumbered and reformulated the provision of the *CCAA* stating that, subject to exceptions for source deductions, deemed trusts do not survive the *CCAA* proceedings and thus the *CCAA* is now the later in time statute. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*.

54 I do not agree with my colleague Abella J. that s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, can be used to interpret the 2005 amendments as having no effect. The new statute can hardly be said to be a mere re-enactment of the former statute. Indeed, the *CCAA* underwent a substantial review in 2005. Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BLA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes with respect to corporate proposals. In addition, new provisions were introduced regarding the treatment of contracts, collective agreements, interim financing and governance agreements. The appointment and role of the Monitor was also clarified. Noteworthy are the limits imposed by *CCAA s. 11.09* on the court's discretion to make an order staying the Crown's source deductions deemed trusts, which were formerly found in s. 11.4. No mention whatsoever is made of GST deemed trusts (see Summary to *S.C. 2005, c. 47*). The review went as far as looking at the very expression used to describe the statutory override of deemed trusts. The comments cited by my colleague only emphasize the clear intent of Parliament to maintain its policy that only source deductions deemed trusts survive in *CCAA* proceedings.

55 In the case at bar, the legislative context informs the determination of Parliament's legislative intent and supports the conclusion that *ETA s. 222(3)* was not intended to narrow the scope of the *CCAA*'s override provision. Viewed in its entire context, the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real. I would therefore not follow the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators* and affirm that *CCAA s. 18.3* remained effective.

56 My conclusion is reinforced by the purpose of the *CCAA* as part of Canadian remedial insolvency legislation. As this aspect is particularly relevant to the second issue, I will now discuss how courts have interpreted the scope of their discretionary powers in supervising a *CCAA* reorganization and how Parliament has largely endorsed this interpretation. Indeed, the interpretation courts have given to the *CCAA* helps in understanding how the *CCAA* grew to occupy such a prominent role in Canadian insolvency law.

3.3 Discretionary Power of a Court Supervising a CCAA Reorganization

57 Courts frequently observe that "[t]he *CCAA* is skeletal in nature" and does not "contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred" (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 44, *per* Blair J.A.). Accordingly, "[t]he history of *CCAA* law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation" (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at para. 10, *per* Farley J.).

58 *CCAA* decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly describes as "the hothouse of real-time litigation" has been the primary method by which the *CCAA* has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (see Jones, at p. 484).

59 Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 57, per Doherty J.A., dissenting)

60 Judicial decision making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed (see, e.g., *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]), at para. 27). In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company (see, e.g., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 144, per Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re* [2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], 2003 CanLII 49366, at para. 13, per Farley J.; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 181-92 and 217-26). In addition, courts must recognize that on occasion the broader public interest will be engaged by aspects of the reorganization and may be a factor against which the decision of whether to allow a particular action will be weighed (see, e.g., *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 2, per Blair J. (as he then was); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 195-214).

61 When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*. Without exhaustively cataloguing the various measures taken under the authority of the *CCAA*, it is useful to refer briefly to a few examples to illustrate the flexibility the statute affords supervising courts.

62 Perhaps the most creative use of *CCAA* authority has been the increasing willingness of courts to authorize post-filing security for debtor in possession financing or super-priority charges on the debtor's assets when necessary for the continuation of the debtor's business during the reorganization (see, e.g., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96 (B.C. C.A.), aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); and generally, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at pp. 93-115). The *CCAA* has also been used to release claims against third parties as part of approving a comprehensive plan of arrangement and compromise, even over the objections of some dissenting creditors (see *Metcalf & Mansfield*). As well, the appointment of a Monitor to oversee the reorganization was originally a measure taken pursuant to the *CCAA*'s supervisory authority; Parliament responded, making the mechanism mandatory by legislative amendment.

63 Judicial innovation during *CCAA* proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) what are the sources of a court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings? (2) what are the limits of this authority?

64 The first question concerns the boundary between a court's statutory authority under the *CCAA* and a court's residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. In authorizing measures during *CCAA* proceedings, courts have on occasion purported to rely upon their equitable jurisdiction to advance the purposes of the Act or their inherent jurisdiction to fill gaps in the statute. Recent appellate decisions have counselled against purporting to rely on inherent jurisdiction, holding that the better view is that courts are in most cases simply construing the authority supplied by the *CCAA* itself (see, e.g., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), paras. 31-33, *per* Blair J.A.).

65 I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

66 Having examined the pertinent parts of the *CCAA* and the recent history of the legislation, I accept that in most instances the issuance of an order during *CCAA* proceedings should be considered an exercise in statutory interpretation. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the statute at issue is capable of supporting.

67 The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company ... on the application of any person interested in the matter ..., subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

68 In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

69 The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

70 The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

71 It is well-established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*'s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

72 The preceding discussion assists in determining whether the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of proceedings against the Crown once it was apparent that reorganization would fail and bankruptcy was the inevitable next step.

73 In the Court of Appeal, Tysoe J.A. held that no authority existed under the *CCAA* to continue staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust once efforts at reorganization had come to an end. The appellant submits that in so holding, Tysoe J.A. failed to consider the underlying purpose of the *CCAA* and give the statute an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation under which the order was permissible. The Crown submits that Tysoe J.A. correctly held that the mandatory language of the *ETA* gave the court no option but to permit enforcement of the GST deemed trust when lifting the *CCAA* stay to permit the debtor to make an assignment under the *BIA*. Whether the *ETA* has a mandatory effect in the context of a *CCAA* proceeding has already been discussed. I will now address the question of whether the order was authorized by the *CCAA*.

74 It is beyond dispute that the *CCAA* imposes no explicit temporal limitations upon proceedings commenced under the Act that would prohibit ordering a continuation of the stay of the Crown's GST claims while lifting the general stay of proceedings temporarily to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy.

75 The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the *CCAA*. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the *CCAA* was accordingly spent. I disagree.

76 There is no doubt that had reorganization been commenced under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, the Crown's deemed trust priority for the GST funds would have been lost. Similarly, the Crown does not dispute that under the scheme of distribution in bankruptcy under the *BIA*, the deemed trust for GST ceases to have effect. Thus, after reorganization under the *CCAA* failed, creditors would have had a strong incentive to seek immediate bankruptcy and distribution of the debtor's assets under the *BIA*. In order to conclude that the discretion does not extend to partially lifting the stay in order to allow for an assignment in bankruptcy, one would have to assume a gap between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* proceedings. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s order staying Crown enforcement of the GST claim ensured that creditors would not be disadvantaged by the attempted reorganization under the *CCAA*. The effect of his order was to blunt any impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation. His order was thus in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives to the extent that it allowed a bridge between the *CCAA* and *BIA* proceedings. This interpretation of the tribunal's discretionary power is buttressed by s. 20 of the *CCAA*. That section provides that the *CCAA* "may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament... that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them", such as the *BIA*. Section 20 clearly indicates the intention of Parliament for the *CCAA* to operate *in tandem* with other insolvency legislation, such as the *BIA*.

77 The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all. Because the alternative to reorganization is often bankruptcy, participants will measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation. In the case at bar, the order fostered a harmonious transition between reorganization and liquidation while meeting the objective of a single collective proceeding that is common to both statutes.

78 Tysoe J.A. therefore erred in my view by treating the *CCAA* and the *BIA* as distinct regimes subject to a temporal gap between the two, rather than as forming part of an integrated body of insolvency law. Parliament's decision to maintain two statutory schemes for reorganization, the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, reflects the reality that reorganizations of differing complexity require different legal mechanisms. By contrast, only one statutory scheme has been found to be needed to liquidate a bankrupt debtor's estate. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of the *BIA* proceedings. However, as Laskin J.A. for the Ontario Court of Appeal noted in a similar competition between secured creditors and the Ontario Superintendent of Financial Services seeking to enforce a deemed trust, "[t]he two statutes are related" and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be lost in bankruptcy *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (Ont. C.A.), at paras. 62-63).

79 The Crown's priority in claims pursuant to source deductions deemed trusts does not undermine this conclusion. Source deductions deemed trusts survive under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Accordingly, creditors' incentives to prefer one Act over another will not be affected. While a court has a broad discretion to stay source deductions deemed trusts in the *CCAA* context, this discretion is nevertheless subject to specific limitations applicable only to source deductions deemed trusts (*CCAA*, s. 11.4).

Thus, if *CCAA* reorganization fails (e.g., either the creditors or the court refuse a proposed reorganization), the Crown can immediately assert its claim in unremitted source deductions. But this should not be understood to affect a seamless transition into bankruptcy or create any "gap" between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* for the simple reason that, regardless of what statute the reorganization had been commenced under, creditors' claims in both instances would have been subject to the priority of the Crown's source deductions deemed trust.

80 Source deductions deemed trusts aside, the comprehensive and exhaustive mechanism under the *BIA* must control the distribution of the debtor's assets once liquidation is inevitable. Indeed, an orderly transition to liquidation is mandatory under the *BIA* where a proposal is rejected by creditors. The *CCAA* is silent on the transition into liquidation but the breadth of the court's discretion under the Act is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. The court must do so in a manner that does not subvert the scheme of distribution under the *BIA*. Transition to liquidation requires partially lifting the *CCAA* stay to commence proceedings under the *BIA*. This necessary partial lifting of the stay should not trigger a race to the courthouse in an effort to obtain priority unavailable under the *BIA*.

81 I therefore conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the authority under the *CCAA* to lift the stay to allow entry into liquidation.

3.4 Express Trust

82 The last issue in this case is whether Brenner C.J.S.C. created an express trust in favour of the Crown when he ordered on April 29, 2008, that proceeds from the sale of LeRoy Trucking's assets equal to the amount of unremitted GST be held back in the Monitor's trust account until the results of the reorganization were known. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

83 Creation of an express trust requires the presence of three certainties: intention, subject matter, and object. Express or "true trusts" arise from the acts and intentions of the settlor and are distinguishable from other trusts arising by operation of law (see D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen and L. D. Smith, eds., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3rd ed. 2005), at pp. 28-29 especially fn. 42).

84 Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) inferable from the court's order of April 29, 2008, sufficient to support an express trust.

85 At the time of the order, there was a dispute between Century Services and the Crown over part of the proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets. The court's solution was to accept LeRoy Trucking's proposal to segregate those monies until that dispute could be resolved. Thus there was no certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust.

86 The fact that the location chosen to segregate those monies was the Monitor's trust account has no independent effect such that it would overcome the lack of a clear beneficiary. In any event, under the interpretation of *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) established above, no such priority dispute would even arise because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the *CCAA* and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount. However, Brenner C.J.S.C. may well have been proceeding on the basis that, in accordance with *Ottawa Senators*, the Crown's GST claim would remain effective if reorganization was successful, which would not be the case if transition to the liquidation process of the *BIA* was allowed. An amount equivalent to that claim would accordingly be set aside pending the outcome of reorganization.

87 Thus, uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the *CCAA* restructuring eliminates the existence of any certainty to permanently vest in the Crown a beneficial interest in the funds. That much is clear from the oral reasons of Brenner C.J.S.C. on April 29, 2008, when he said: "Given the fact that [*CCAA* proceedings] are known to fail and filings in bankruptcy result, it seems to me that maintaining the status quo in the case at bar supports the proposal to have the monitor hold these funds in trust." Exactly who might take the money in the final result was therefore evidently in doubt. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s subsequent order of September 3, 2008, denying the Crown's application to enforce the trust once it was clear that bankruptcy was inevitable, confirms the absence of a clear beneficiary required to ground an express trust.

4. Conclusion

88 I conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the discretion under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of the Crown's claim for enforcement of the GST deemed trust while otherwise lifting it to permit LeRoy Trucking to make an assignment in bankruptcy. My conclusion that s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* nullified the GST deemed trust while proceedings under that Act were pending confirms that the discretionary jurisdiction under s. 11 utilized by the court was not limited by the Crown's asserted GST priority, because there is no such priority under the *CCAA*.

89 For these reasons, I would allow the appeal and declare that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada is not subject to deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. Nor is this amount subject to an express trust. Costs are awarded for this appeal and the appeal in the court below.

Fish J. (concurring):

I

90 I am in general agreement with the reasons of Justice Deschamps and would dispose of the appeal as she suggests.

91 More particularly, I share my colleague's interpretation of the scope of the judge's discretion under s. 11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). And I share my colleague's conclusion that Brenner C.J.S.C. did not create an express trust in favour of the Crown when he segregated GST funds into the Monitor's trust account (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

92 I nonetheless feel bound to add brief reasons of my own regarding the interaction between the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*").

93 In upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), and its progeny have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In my respectful view, a clearly marked departure from that jurisprudential approach is warranted in this case.

94 Justice Deschamps develops important historical and policy reasons in support of this position and I have nothing to add in that regard. I do wish, however, to explain why a comparative analysis of related statutory provisions adds support to our shared conclusion.

95 Parliament has in recent years given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme. It has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case. Ours is not to wonder why, but rather to treat Parliament's preservation of the relevant provisions as a deliberate exercise of the legislative discretion that is Parliament's alone. With respect, I reject any suggestion that we should instead characterize the apparent conflict between s. 18.3(1) (now s. 37(1)) of the *CCAA* and s. 222 of the *ETA* as a drafting anomaly or statutory lacuna properly subject to judicial correction or repair.

II

96 In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, a deemed trust will be found to exist only where two complementary elements co-exist: first, a statutory provision *creating* the trust; and second, a *CCAA* or *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*") provision *confirming* — or explicitly preserving — its effective operation.

97 This interpretation is reflected in three federal statutes. Each contains a deemed trust provision framed in terms strikingly similar to the wording of s. 222 of the *ETA*.

98 The first is the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*") where s. 227(4) *creates* a deemed trust:

227 (4) Trust for moneys deducted — Every person who deducts or withholds an amount under this Act is deemed, notwithstanding any security interest (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) in the amount so deducted or withheld, to hold

the amount separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) of that person that but for the security interest would be property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty and for payment to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act. [Here and below, the emphasis is of course my own.]

99 In the next subsection, Parliament has taken care to make clear that this trust is unaffected by federal or provincial legislation to the contrary:

(4.1) Extension of trust — Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (except sections 81.1 and 81.2 of that Act), any other enactment of Canada, any enactment of a province or any other law, where at any time an amount deemed by subsection 227(4) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not paid to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act, property of the person ... equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was deducted or withheld by the person, separate and apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of such property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all such security interests.

100 The continued operation of this deemed trust is expressly *confirmed* in s. 18.3 of the *CCAA*:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*...

101 The operation of the *ITA* deemed trust is also confirmed in s. 67 of the *BIA*:

67 (2) Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*...

102 Thus, Parliament has first *created* and then *confirmed the continued operation* of the Crown's *ITA* deemed trust under *both* the *CCAA* and the *BIA* regimes.

103 The second federal statute for which this scheme holds true is the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8 ("*CPP*"). At s. 23, Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown and specifies that it exists despite all contrary provisions in any other Canadian statute. Finally, and in almost identical terms, the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 ("*EIA*"), creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown: see ss. 86(2) and (2.1).

104 As we have seen, the survival of the deemed trusts created under these provisions of the *ITA*, the *CPP* and the *EIA* is confirmed in s. 18.3(2) the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) the *BIA*. In all three cases, Parliament's intent to enforce the Crown's deemed trust through insolvency proceedings is expressed in clear and unmistakable terms.

105 The same is not true with regard to the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it does not *confirm* the trust — or expressly provide for its continued operation — in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*. The second of the two mandatory elements I have mentioned is thus absent reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

106 The language of the relevant *ETA* provisions is identical in substance to that of the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA* provisions:

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

107 Yet no provision of the *CCAA* provides for the continuation of this deemed trust after the *CCAA* is brought into play.

108 In short, Parliament has imposed *two* explicit conditions, or "building blocks", for survival under the *CCAA* of deemed trusts created by the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA*. Had Parliament intended to likewise preserve under the *CCAA* deemed trusts created by the *ETA*, it would have included in the *CCAA* the sort of confirmatory provision that explicitly preserves other deemed trusts.

109 With respect, unlike Tysoe J.A., I do not find it "inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception" (2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.), at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust provisions excerpted above make explicit reference to the *BIA*. Section 222 of the *ETA* does not break the pattern. Given the near-identical wording of the four deemed trust provisions, it would have been surprising indeed had Parliament not addressed the *BIA* at all in the *ETA*.

110 Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings. Accordingly, s. 222 mentions the *BIA* so as to *exclude* it from its ambit — rather than to *include* it, as do the *ITA*, the *CPP*, and the *EIA*.

111 Conversely, I note that *none* of these statutes mentions the *CCAA* expressly. Their specific reference to the *BIA* has no bearing on their interaction with the *CCAA*. Again, it is the confirmatory provisions *in the insolvency statutes* that determine whether a given deemed trust will subsist during insolvency proceedings.

112 Finally, I believe that chambers judges should not segregate GST monies into the Monitor's trust account during *CCAA* proceedings, as was done in this case. The result of Justice Deschamps's reasoning is that GST claims become unsecured under the *CCAA*. Parliament has deliberately chosen to nullify certain Crown super-priorities during insolvency; this is one such instance.

III

113 For these reasons, like Justice Deschamps, I would allow the appeal with costs in this Court and in the courts below and order that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

Abella J. (dissenting):

114 The central issue in this appeal is whether *s. 222 of the Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("EIA")*, and specifically *s. 222(3)*, gives priority during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA")*, proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. I agree with Tysoe J.A. that it does. It follows, in my respectful view, that a court's discretion under *s. 11 of the CCAA* is circumscribed accordingly.

115 Section 11¹ of the *CCAA* stated:

11. (1) Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

To decide the scope of the court's discretion under *s. 11*, it is necessary to first determine the priority issue. Section 222(3), the provision of the *ETA* at issue in this case, states:

222 (3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

116 Century Services argued that the *CCAA's* general override provision, *s. 18.3(1)*, prevailed, and that the deeming provisions in *s. 222 of the ETA* were, accordingly, inapplicable during *CCAA* proceedings. Section 18.3(1) states:

18.3 (1) ... [N]otwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

117 As MacPherson J.A. correctly observed in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is in "clear conflict" with s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (para. 31). Resolving the conflict between the two provisions is, essentially, what seems to me to be a relatively uncomplicated exercise in statutory interpretation: does the language reflect a clear legislative intention? In my view it does. The deemed trust provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, has unambiguous language stating that it operates notwithstanding any law except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*").

118 By expressly excluding only one statute from its legislative grasp, and by unequivocally stating that it applies despite any other law anywhere in Canada *except* the *BIA*, s. 222(3) has defined its boundaries in the clearest possible terms. I am in complete agreement with the following comments of MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*:

The legislative intent of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is clear. If there is a conflict with "any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*", s. 222(3) prevails. In these words Parliament did two things: it decided that s. 222(3) should trump all other federal laws and, importantly, it addressed the topic of exceptions to its trumping decision and identified a single exception, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

119 MacPherson J.A.'s view that the failure to exempt the *CCAA* from the operation of the *ETA* is a reflection of a clear legislative intention, is borne out by how the *CCAA* was subsequently changed after s. 18.3(1) was enacted in 1997. In 2000, when s. 222(3) of the *ETA* came into force, amendments were also introduced to the *CCAA*. Section 18.3(1) was not amended.

120 The failure to amend s. 18.3(1) is notable because its effect was to protect the legislative *status quo*, notwithstanding repeated requests from various constituencies that s. 18.3(1) be amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. In 2002, for example, when Industry Canada conducted a review of the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals recommended that the priority regime under the *BIA* be extended to the *CCAA* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (March 15, 2002), Sch. B, proposal 71, at pp. 37-38). The same recommendations were made by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its 2003 report, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; by the Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) of the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals in its 2005 *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*; and in 2007 by the Insolvency Institute of Canada in a submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce commenting on reforms then under consideration.

121 Yet the *BIA* remains the only exempted statute under s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Even after the 2005 decision in *Ottawa Senators* which confirmed that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA*, there was no responsive legislative revision. I see this lack of response as relevant in this case, as it was in *R. v. Tele-Mobile Co.*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305 (S.C.C.), where this Court stated:

While it cannot be said that legislative silence is necessarily determinative of legislative intention, in this case the silence is Parliament's answer to the consistent urging of Telus and other affected businesses and organizations that there be express language in the legislation to ensure that businesses can be reimbursed for the reasonable costs of complying with evidence-gathering orders. I see the legislative history as reflecting Parliament's intention that compensation not be paid for compliance with production orders. [para. 42]

122 All this leads to a clear inference of a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

123 Nor do I see any "policy" justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention. I can do no better by way of explaining why I think the policy argument cannot succeed in this case, than to repeat the words of Tysoe J.A. who said:

I do not dispute that there are valid policy reasons for encouraging insolvent companies to attempt to restructure their affairs so that their business can continue with as little disruption to employees and other stakeholders as possible. It is appropriate for the courts to take such policy considerations into account, but only if it is in connection with a matter that has not been considered by Parliament. Here, Parliament must be taken to have weighed policy considerations when it enacted the amendments to the *CCAA* and *ETA* described above. As Mr. Justice MacPherson observed at para. 43 of *Ottawa Senators*, it is inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. I also make the observation that the 1992 set of amendments to the *BIA* enabled proposals to be binding on secured creditors and, while there is more flexibility under the *CCAA*, it is possible for an insolvent company to attempt to restructure under the auspices of the *BIA*. [para. 37]

124 Despite my view that the clarity of the language in s. 222(3) is dispositive, it is also my view that even the application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. In their submissions, the parties raised the following as being particularly relevant: the Crown relied on the principle that the statute which is "later in time" prevails; and Century Services based its argument on the principle that the general provision gives way to the specific (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

125 The "later in time" principle gives priority to a more recent statute, based on the theory that the legislature is presumed to be aware of the content of existing legislation. If a new enactment is inconsistent with a prior one, therefore, the legislature is presumed to have intended to derogate from the earlier provisions (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5th ed. 2008), at pp. 346-47; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3rd ed. 2000), at p. 358).

126 The exception to this presumptive displacement of pre-existing inconsistent legislation, is the *generalia specialibus non derogant* principle that "[a] more recent, general provision will not be construed as affecting an earlier, special provision" (Côté, at p. 359). Like a Russian Doll, there is also an exception within this exception, namely, that an earlier, specific provision may in fact be "overruled" by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails (*Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.)).

127 The primary purpose of these interpretive principles is to assist in the performance of the task of determining the intention of the legislature. This was confirmed by MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*, at para. 42:

[T]he overarching rule of statutory interpretation is that statutory provisions should be interpreted to give effect to the intention of the legislature in enacting the law. This primary rule takes precedence over all maxims or canons or aids relating to statutory interpretation, including the maxim that the specific prevails over the general (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). As expressed by Hudson J. in *Canada v. Williams*, [1944] S.C.R. 226, ... at p. 239 ...:

The maxim *generalia specialibus non derogant* is relied on as a rule which should dispose of the question, but the maxim is not a rule of law but a rule of construction and bows to the intention of the legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-André Côté, with the collaboration of S. Beaulac and M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4th ed. 2009), at para. 1335.)

128 I accept the Crown's argument that the "later in time" principle is conclusive in this case. Since s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted in 2000 and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* was introduced in 1997, s. 222(3) is, on its face, the later provision. This chronological victory can be displaced, as Century Services argues, if it is shown that the more recent provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, is a general one, in which case the earlier, specific provision, s. 18.3(1), prevails (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). But, as previously explained, the prior specific provision does not take precedence if the subsequent general provision appears to "overrule" it. This, it seems to me, is precisely what s. 222(3) achieves through the use of language stating that it prevails

despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" *other than the BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3).

129 It is true that when the *CCAA* was amended in 2005,² s. 18.3(1) was re-enacted as s. 37(1) (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131). Deschamps J. suggests that this makes s. 37(1) the new, "later in time" provision. With respect, her observation is refuted by the operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, which expressly deals with the (non) effect of re-enacting, without significant substantive changes, a repealed provision (see *Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board)*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663 (Fed. C.A.), dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as "new law" unless they differ in substance from the repealed provision:

44. Where an enactment, in this section called the "former enactment", is repealed and another enactment, in this section called the "new enactment", is substituted therefor,

...

(f) except to the extent that the provisions of the new enactment are not in substance the same as those of the former enactment, the new enactment shall not be held to operate as new law, but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation and as declaratory of the law as contained in the former enactment;

Section 2 of the *Interpretation Act* defines an enactment as "an Act or regulation or *any portion of an Act or regulation*".

130 Section 37(1) of the current *CCAA* is almost identical to s. 18.3(1). These provisions are set out for ease of comparison, with the differences between them underlined:

37.(1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

131 The application of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act* simply confirms the government's clearly expressed intent, found in Industry Canada's clause-by-clause review of Bill C-55, where s. 37(1) was identified as "a technical amendment to reorder the provisions of this Act". During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate, confirmed that s. 37(1) represented only a technical change:

On a technical note relating to the treatment of deemed trusts for taxes, the bill [*sic*] makes no changes to the underlying policy intent, despite the fact that in the case of a restructuring under the *CCAA*, sections of the act [*sic*] were repealed and substituted with renumbered versions due to the extensive reworking of the *CCAA*.

(*Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, at p. 2147)

132 Had the substance of s. 18.3(1) altered in any material way when it was replaced by s. 37(1), I would share Deschamps J.'s view that it should be considered a new provision. But since s. 18.3(1) and s. 37(1) are the same in substance, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision (Sullivan, at p. 347).

133 This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. The question then is how that priority affects the discretion of a court under s. 11 of the *CCAA*.

134 While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore

circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes *other* than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

135 Given this conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider whether there was an express trust.

136 I would dismiss the appeal.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.

Appendix

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at December 13, 2007)

11. (1) Powers of court — Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

...

(3) Initial application court orders — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(4) Other than initial application court orders — A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

...

(6) Burden of proof on application — The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.4 (1) Her Majesty affected — An order made under [section 11](#) may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#) or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#) and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiration of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or arrangement in respect of the company; and\

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company where the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a similar purpose to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#), or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — An order referred to in subsection (1) ceases to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

- (i) [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#),
- (ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#) and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or
- (iii) under any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#), or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11, other than an order referred to in subsection (1) of this section, does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

18.3 (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under [subsection 227\(4\)](#) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or [subsection 86\(2\)](#) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in [subsection 227\(4\)](#) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

18.4 (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 18.5 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Operation of similar legislation — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) [subsections 224\(1.2\)](#) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to [subsection 224\(1.2\)](#) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to [subsection 224\(1.2\)](#) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as [subsection 224\(1.2\)](#)

of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

...

20. [Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts] — The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at September 18, 2009)

11. General power of court — Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

...

11.02 (1) Stays, etc. — initial application — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application — A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(3) Burden of proof on application — The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

...

11.09 (1) Stay — Her Majesty — An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of

the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiry of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#), or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in [subsection 3\(1\) of the *Canada Pension Plan*](#) and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#),

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#) and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#), or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in [subsection 3\(1\) of the *Canada Pension Plan*](#) and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

37. (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision"), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (as at December 13, 2007)

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

(1.1) Amounts collected before bankruptcy — Subsection (1) does not apply, at or after the time a person becomes a bankrupt (within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), to any amounts that, before that time, were collected or became collectible by the person as or on account of tax under Division II.

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (as at December 13, 2007)

67. (1) Property of bankrupt — The property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall not comprise

- (a) property held by the bankrupt in trust for any other person,
- (b) any property that as against the bankrupt is exempt from execution or seizure under any laws applicable in the province within which the property is situated and within which the bankrupt resides, or
- (b.1) such goods and services tax credit payments and prescribed payments relating to the essential needs of an individual as are made in prescribed circumstances and are not property referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

but it shall comprise

- (c) all property wherever situated of the bankrupt at the date of his bankruptcy or that may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge, and
- (d) such powers in or over or in respect of the property as might have been exercised by the bankrupt for his own benefit.

(2) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under [subsection 227\(4\)](#) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or [subsection 86\(2\)](#) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

- (a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in [subsection 227\(4\)](#) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in [subsection 3\(1\)](#) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in [subsection 23\(3\)](#) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

86. (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a bankruptcy or proposal, all provable claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or of any body under an Act respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in [section 87](#) called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

- (a) [subsections 224\(1.2\)](#) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*;
- (b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to [subsection 224\(1.2\)](#) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or

an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#), or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in [subsection 3\(1\) of the *Canada Pension Plan*](#) and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as [subsection 224\(1.2\) of the *Income Tax Act*](#) in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as [subsection 23\(2\) of the *Canada Pension Plan*](#) in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

Footnotes

1 [Section 11](#) was amended, effective September 18, 2009, and now states:

11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

2 The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

TAB F

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: *Bauscher-Grant Farms Inc. v. Lake Diefenbaker Potato Corp.* | 1998 CarswellSask 335, 167 Sask. R. 14, [1998] S.J. No. 344, 80 A.C.W.S. (3d) 62, [1998] 8 W.W.R. 751 | (Sask. Q.B., May 11, 1998)

1993 CarswellOnt 183

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division — Commercial List)

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re

1993 CarswellOnt 183, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 37 A.C.W.S. (3d) 847, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275

Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36; Re Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43; Re plan of compromise in respect of LEHNDORFF GENERAL PARTNER LTD. (in its own capacity and in its capacity as general partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA), LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) and LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) II) and in respect of certain of their nominees LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA) LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS II LTD., BAYTEMP PROPERTIES LIMITED and 102 BLOOR STREET WEST LIMITED and in respect of THG LEHNDORFF VERMÖGENSVERWALTUNG GmbH (in its capacity as limited partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA))

Farley J.

Heard: December 24, 1992

Judgment: January 6, 1993

Docket: Doc. B366/92

Counsel: *Alfred Apps, Robert Harrison and Melissa J. Kennedy*, for applicants.

L. Crozier, for Royal Bank of Canada.

R.C. Heintzman, for Bank of Montreal.

J. Hodgson, Susan Lundy and James Hilton, for Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation.

Jay Schwartz, for Citibank Canada.

Stephen Golick, for Peat Marwick Thorne^{*} Inc., proposed monitor.

John Teolis, for Fuji Bank Canada.

Robert Thorton, for certain of the advisory boards.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.i General principles](#)

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Corporations — Arrangements and compromises — [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) — Stay of proceedings — Stay being granted even where it would affect non-applicants that were not companies within meaning of Act — Business operations of applicants and non-applicants being so intertwined as to make stay appropriate.

The applicant companies were involved in property development and management and sought the protection of the [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) ("CCAA") in order that they could present a plan of compromise. They also sought a stay of all proceedings against the individual company applicants either in their own capacities or because of their interest in a larger group of companies. Each of the applicant companies was insolvent and had outstanding debentures issued under trust deeds. They proposed a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of the debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors deemed appropriate in the circumstances.

A question arose as to whether the court had the power to grant a stay of proceedings against non-applicants that were not companies and, therefore, not within the express provisions of the [CCAA](#).

Held:

The application was allowed.

It was appropriate, given the significant financial intertwining of the applicant companies, that a consolidated plan be approved. Further, each of the applicant companies had a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating even though each was currently unable to meet all of its expenses. This was precisely the sort of situation in which all of the creditors would likely benefit from the application of the [CCAA](#) and in which it was appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings.

The inherent power of the court to grant stays can be used to supplement [s. 11 of the CCAA](#) when it is just and reasonable to do so. Clearly, the court had the jurisdiction to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants that were companies fitting the criteria in the [CCAA](#). However, the stay requested also involved limited partnerships where (1) the applicant companies acted on behalf of the limited partnerships, or (2) the stay would be effective against any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertakings of the limited partnerships in which they held a direct interest. The business operations of the applicant companies were so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for a stay to be granted to the applicant companies that would affect their business without affecting the undivided interest of the limited partnerships in the business. As a result, it was just and reasonable to supplement [s. 11](#) and grant the stay.

While the provisions of the [CCAA](#) allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim, as well as the interest of any other person, anyone wishing to start or continue proceedings against the applicant companies could use the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain the stay. In such a motion, the onus would be on the applicant companies to show that it was appropriate in the circumstances to continue the stay.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Amirault Fish Co., Re, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to

Associated Investors of Canada Ltd., Re, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237, Alta. L.R. (2d) 259, [1988] 2 W.W.R. 211, 38 B.L.R. 148, (sub nom. *Re First Investors Corp.*) 46 D.L.R. (4th) 669 (Q.B.), reversed (1988), 71 C.B.R. 71, 60 Alta. L.R. (2d) 242, 89 A.R. 344 (C.A.) — referred to

Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Canada Systems Group (EST) v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co. (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) [affirmed (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 135, 33 C.P.C. 210, 145 D.L.R. (3d) 266 (C.A.)] — referred to

Empire-Universal Films Ltd. v. Rank, [1947] O.R. 775 [H.C.] — referred to

Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp., Re, 28 C.B.R. 124, [1947] Que. K.B. 348 (C.A.) — referred to

Fine's Flowers Ltd. v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of) (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 87, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 293, 87 D.L.R. (4th) 391, 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.) — referred to

Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc. (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (C.S. Que.) [affirmed (1982), 45 C.B.R. (N.S.) 11 (Que. C.A.)] — referred to

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (C.A.) — referred to

Inducon Development Corp. Re (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.B. Ltd. (1992), 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290 (Q.B.) — considered

Keppoch Development Ltd., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to

Langley's Ltd., Re, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.) — referred to
McCordic v. Bosanquet (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) — referred to
Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Q.B.) — referred to
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 1 (Q.B.) — referred to
Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to
Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (C.A.) — referred to
Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp. (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) , affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (note), 55 B.C.L.R. (2d) xxxiii (note), 135 N.R. 317 (note) — referred to
Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75 — referred to
Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R. (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137, 104 D.L.R. (3d) 274 (S.C.) , affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) — referred to
Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312, 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Slavik, Re (1992), 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.) — considered
Stephanie's Fashions Ltd., Re (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to
Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of) (1990), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 151, (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) — referred to
United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative, Re (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, 84 N.B.R. (2d) 415, 214 A.P.R. 415 (Q.B.) , varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, 87 N.B.R. (2d) 333, 221 A.P.R. 333 (Q.B.) , reversed (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161, 88 N.B.R. (2d) 253, 224 A.P.R. 253, (sub nom. *Cdn. Co-op. Leasing Services v. United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.*) 51 D.L.R. (4th) 618 (C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 —

s. 85

s. 142

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — preamble

s. 2

s. 3

s. 4

s. 5

s. 6

s. 7

s. 8

s. 11

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43.

Judicature Act, The, R.S.O. 1937, c. 100.

Limited Partnerships Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 —

s. 2(2)

s. 3(1)

s. 8

s. 9

s. 11

s. 12(1)

s. 13

s. 15(2)

s. 24

Partnership Act, R.S.A. 1980, c.P-2 — Pt. 2

s. 75

Rules considered:

Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure —

r. 8.01

r. 8.02

Application under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to file consolidated plan of compromise and for stay of proceedings.

Farley J.:

1 These are my written reasons relating to the relief granted the applicants on December 24, 1992 pursuant to their application under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") and the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 ("CJA"). The relief sought was as follows:

- (a) short service of the notice of application;
- (b) a declaration that the applicants were companies to which the CCAA applies;
- (c) authorization for the applicants to file a consolidated plan of compromise;
- (d) authorization for the applicants to call meetings of their secured and unsecured creditors to approve the consolidated plan of compromise;
- (e) a stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken either in respect of the applicants in their own capacity or on account of their interest in Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) ("LUPC"), Lehndorff Properties (Canada) ("LPC") and Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II ("LPC II") and collectively (the "Limited Partnerships") whether as limited partner, as general partner or as registered titleholder to certain of their assets as bare trustee and nominee; and
- (f) certain other ancillary relief.

2 The applicants are a number of companies within the larger Lehndorff group ("Group") which operates in Canada and elsewhere. The group appears to have suffered in the same way that a number of other property developers and managers which have also sought protection under the CCAA in recent years. The applicants are insolvent; they each have outstanding debentures issues under trust deeds; and they propose a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of these debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors as they deemed appropriate in the circumstances. Each applicant except THG Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH ("GmbH") is an Ontario corporation. GmbH is a company incorporated under the laws of Germany. Each of the applicants has assets or does business in Canada. Therefore each is a "company" within the definition of s. 2 of the CCAA. The applicant Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. ("General Partner Company") is the sole general partner of the Limited Partnerships. The General Partner Company has sole control over the property and businesses of the Limited Partnerships. All major decisions concerning the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are made by management operating out of the Lehndorff Toronto Office. The applicants aside from the General Partner Company have as their sole purpose the holding of title to properties as bare trustee or nominee on behalf of the Limited Partnerships. LUPC is a limited partnership registered under the *Limited Partnership Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 ("Ontario LPA"). LPC and LPC II are limited partnerships registered under Part 2 of the *Partnership Act*, R.S.A. 1980, c. P-2 ("Alberta PA") and each is registered in Ontario as an extra provincial limited partnership. LUPC has over 2,000 beneficial limited partners, LPC over 500 and LPC II over 250, most of whom are residents of Germany. As at March 31, 1992 LUPC had outstanding indebtedness of approximately \$370 million, LPC \$45 million and LPC II \$7 million. Not all of the members of the Group are making an application under the CCAA. Taken together the Group's indebtedness as to Canadian matters (including that of the applicants) was approximately \$543 million. In the summer of 1992 various creditors (Canada Trustco Mortgage Company, Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Tokyo Canada) made demands for repayment of their loans. On November 6, 1992 Funtanua Investments Limited, a minor secured lender also made a demand. An interim standstill agreement was worked out following a meeting of July 7, 1992. In conjunction with Peat Marwick Thorne Inc. which has been acting as an informal monitor to date and Fasken Campbell Godfrey the applicants have held multiple meetings with their senior secured creditors over the past half year and worked on a restructuring plan. The business affairs of the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are significantly intertwined as there are multiple instances of intercorporate debt, cross-default provisions and guarantees and they operated a centralized cash management system.

3 This process has now evolved to a point where management has developed a consolidated restructuring plan which plan addresses the following issues:

- (a) The compromise of existing conventional, term and operating indebtedness, both secured and unsecured.
- (b) The restructuring of existing project financing commitments.
- (c) New financing, by way of equity or subordinated debt.
- (d) Elimination or reduction of certain overhead.
- (e) Viability of existing businesses of entities in the Lehndorff Group.
- (f) Restructuring of income flows from the limited partnerships.
- (g) Disposition of further real property assets aside from those disposed of earlier in the process.
- (h) Consolidation of entities in the Group; and
- (i) Rationalization of the existing debt and security structure in the continuing entities in the Group.

Formal meetings of the beneficial limited partners of the Limited Partnerships are scheduled for January 20 and 21, 1993 in Germany and an information circular has been prepared and at the time of hearing was being translated into German. This application was brought on for hearing at this time for two general reasons: (a) it had now ripened to the stage of proceeding with what had been distilled out of the strategic and consultative meetings; and (b) there were creditors other than senior secured

lenders who were in a position to enforce their rights against assets of some of the applicants (and Limited Partnerships) which if such enforcement did take place would result in an undermining of the overall plan. Notice of this hearing was given to various creditors: Barclays Bank of Canada, Barclays Bank PLC, Bank of Montreal, Citibank Canada, Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation, Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Tokyo Canada, Funtauna Investments Limited, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Fuji Bank Canada and First City Trust Company. In this respect the applicants have recognized that although the initial application under the CCAA may be made on an ex parte basis (s. 11 of the CCAA; *Re Langley's Ltd.*, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.); *Re Keppoch Development Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.). The court will be concerned when major creditors have not been alerted even in the most minimal fashion (*Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 310). The application was either supported or not opposed.

4 "Instant" debentures are now well recognized and respected by the courts: see *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative* (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44 (N.B. Q.B.), at pp. 55-56, varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170 (N.B. Q.B.), reversed on different grounds (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161 (N.B. C.A.), at pp. 165-166; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) at pp. 250-251; *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (C.A.) per Doherty J.A., dissenting on another point, at pp. 306-310 (O.R.); *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) at p. 327. The applicants would appear to me to have met the technical hurdle of s. 3 and as defined s. 2) of the CCAA in that they are debtor companies since they are insolvent, they have outstanding an issue of debentures under a trust deed and the compromise or arrangement that is proposed includes that compromise between the applicants and the holders of those trust deed debentures. I am also satisfied that because of the significant intertwining of the applicants it would be appropriate to have a consolidated plan. I would also understand that this court (Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)) is the appropriate court to hear this application since all the applicants except GmbH have their head office or their chief place of business in Ontario and GmbH, although it does not have a place of business within Canada, does have assets located within Ontario.

5 The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA; *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 at p. 661, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75; *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 219-220; *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361 (Q.B.), at pp. 12-13 (C.B.R.); *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 310-311, affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (S.C.C.); *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)*, supra, at p. 307 (O.R.); *Fine's Flowers v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of)* (1992), 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.), at p. 199 and "Reorganizations Under The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", Stanley E. Edwards (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 592.

6 The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA. see *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)*, supra at pp. 297 and 316; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.*, supra, at pp. 251-252 and *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)*, supra, at p. 328 and p. 330. It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed: see *Meridian Developments*

Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, supra, at p. 220 (W.W.R.). The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the CCAA because this affect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the CCAA must be for the debtor and all of the creditors: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 108-110; *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), at pp. 315-318 (C.B.R.) and *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.*, supra, at pp. 251-252.

7 One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors. Unlike the *Bankruptcy Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, before the amendments effective November 30, 1992 to transform it into the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"), it is possible under the CCAA to bind secured creditors it has been generally speculated that the CCAA will be resorted to by companies that are generally larger and have a more complicated capital structure and that those companies which make an application under the BIA will be generally smaller and have a less complicated structure. Reorganization may include partial liquidation where it is intended as part of the process of a return to long term viability and profitability. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, supra, at p. 318 and *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.* (1987), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 245, reversed on other grounds at (1988), 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 71 (Alta. C.A.). It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company or simply a substantial downsizing of its business operations, provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally. See *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.*, supra, at p. 318; *Re Amirault Fish Co.*, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) at pp. 187-188 (C.B.R.).

8 It strikes me that each of the applicants in this case has a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating, although each is currently unable to meet all of its expenses albeit on a reduced scale. This is precisely the sort of circumstance in which all of the creditors are likely to benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it is appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings so as to allow the applicant to finalize preparation of and file a plan of compromise and arrangement.

9 Let me now review the aspect of the stay of proceedings. Section 11 of the CCAA provides as follows:

11. Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,

(a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy Act* and the *Winding-up Act* or either of them;

(b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and

(c) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

10 The power to grant a stay of proceeding should be construed broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking CCAA protection. The power to grant a stay therefore extends to a stay which affected the position not only of the company's secured and unsecured creditors, but also all non-creditors and other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the plan and thereby the continuance of the company. See *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.*, supra, at pp. 12-17 (C.B.R.) and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 296-298 (B.C. S.C.) and pp. 312-314 (B.C. C.A.) and *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, supra, at pp. 219 ff. Further the court has the power to order a stay that is effective in respect of the rights arising in favour of secured creditors under all forms of commercial security: see *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, supra, at p. 320 where Gibbs J.A. for the court stated:

The trend which emerges from this sampling will be given effect here by holding that where the word "security" occurs in the *C.C.A.A.*, it includes s. 178 security and, where the word creditor occurs, it includes a bank holding s. 178 security. To the extent that there may be conflict between the two statutes, therefore, the broad scope of the *C.C.A.A.* prevails.

11 The power to grant a stay may also extend to preventing persons seeking to terminate or cancel executory contracts, including, without limitation agreements with the applying companies for the supply of goods or services, from doing so: see *Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc.* (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (C.S. Que.) at pp. 290-291 and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 311-312 (B.C. C.A.). The stay may also extend to prevent a mortgagee from proceeding with foreclosure proceedings (see *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) or to prevent landlords from terminating leases, or otherwise enforcing their rights thereunder (see *Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp.* (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (C.A. Que.)). Amounts owing to landlords in respect of arrears of rent or unpaid rent for the unexpired portion of lease terms are properly dealt with in a plan of compromise or arrangement: see *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) especially at p. 318. The jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the *CCAA* in the interest of protecting the debtor company so as to enable it to prepare and file a plan is effective notwithstanding the terms of any contract or instrument to which the debtor company is a party. Section 8 of the *CCAA* provides:

8. This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

The power to grant a stay may also extend to prevent persons from exercising any right of set off in respect of the amounts owed by such a person to the debtor company, irrespective of whether the debtor company has commenced any action in respect of which the defense of set off might be formally asserted: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 312-314 (B.C.C.A.).

12 It was submitted by the applicants that the power to grant a stay of proceedings may also extend to a stay of proceedings against non-applicants who are not companies and accordingly do not come within the express provisions of the *CCAA*. In support thereof they cited a *CCAA* order which was granted staying proceedings against individuals who guaranteed the obligations of a debtor-applicant which was a qualifying company under the terms of the *CCAA*: see *Re Slavik*, unreported, [1992] B.C.J. No. 341 [now reported at 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.)]. However in the *Slavik* situation the individual guarantors were officers and shareholders of two companies which had sought and obtained *CCAA* protection. Vickers J. in that case indicated that the facts of that case included the following unexplained and unamplified fact [at p. 159]:

5. The order provided further that all creditors of Norvik Timber Inc. be enjoined from making demand for payment upon that firm or upon any guarantor of an obligation of the firm until further order of the court.

The *CCAA* reorganization plan involved an assignment of the claims of the creditors to "Newco" in exchange for cash and shares. However the basis of the stay order originally granted was not set forth in this decision.

13 It appears to me that Dickson J. in *International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.D. Ltd.*, unreported, [1992] N.B.J. No. 339 (N.B. Q.B.) [now reported at 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290] was focusing only on the stay arrangements of the *CCAA* when concerning a limited partnership situation he indicated [at p. 295 N.B.R.]:

In August 1991 the limited partnership, through its general partner the plaintiff, applied to the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., c. C-36 for an order delaying the assertion of claims by creditors until an opportunity could be gained to work out with the numerous and sizable creditors a compromise of their claims. An order was obtained but it in due course expired without success having been achieved in arranging with creditors a compromise. *That effort may have been wasted, because it seems questionable that the federal Act could have any application to a limited partnership in circumstances such as these.* (Emphasis added.)

14 I am not persuaded that the words of s. 11 which are quite specific as relating as to a *company* can be enlarged to encompass something other than that. However it appears to me that Blair J. was clearly in the right channel in his analysis in *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* unreported, [1992] O.J. No. 1946 [now reported at 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.)] at pp. 4-7 [at pp. 308-310 C.B.R.].

The Power to Stay

The court has always had an inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings whenever it is just and convenient to do so, in order to control its process or prevent an abuse of that process: see *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.), and cases referred to therein. In the civil context, this general power is also embodied in the very broad terms of s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, which provides as follows:

106. A court, on its own initiative or on motion by any person, whether or not a party, may stay any proceeding in the court on such terms as are considered just.

Recently, Mr. Justice O'Connell has observed that this discretionary power is "highly dependent on the facts of each particular case": *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (unreported) [(June 25, 1992), Doc. 24127/88 (Ont. Gen. Div.)], [1992] O.J. No. 1330.

Apart from this inherent and general jurisdiction to stay proceedings, there are many instances where the court is specifically granted the power to stay in a particular context, by virtue of statute or under the *Rules of Civil Procedure*. The authority to prevent multiplicity of proceedings in the same court, under r. 6.01(1), is an example of the latter. The power to stay judicial and extra-judicial proceedings under s. 11 of the *C.C.A.A.*, is an example of the former. Section 11 of the *C.C.A.A.* provides as follows.

The Power to Stay in the Context of C.C.A.A. Proceedings

By its formal title the *C.C.A.A.* is known as "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors". To ensure the effective nature of such a "facilitative" process it is essential that the debtor company be afforded a respite from the litigious and other rights being exercised by creditors, while it attempts to carry on as a going concern and to negotiate an acceptable corporate restructuring arrangement with such creditors.

In this respect it has been observed that the *C.C.A.A.* is "to be used as a practical and effective way of restructuring corporate indebtedness.": see the case comment following the report of *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.), and the approval of that remark as "a perceptive observation about the attitude of the courts" by Gibbs J.A. in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) at p. 113 [B.C.L.R.].

Gibbs J.A. continued with this comment:

To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the few cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is a *discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra-judicial conduct* against the debtor company *the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period*.

(emphasis added)

I agree with those sentiments and would simply add that, in my view, the restraining power extends as well to conduct which could seriously impair the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on the business purpose of negotiating

the compromise or arrangement. [In this respect, see also *Sairex GmbH v. Prudential Steel Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 62 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 77.]

I must have regard to these foregoing factors while I consider, as well, the general principles which have historically governed the court's exercise of its power to stay proceedings. These principles were reviewed by Mr. Justice Montgomery in *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance*, supra (a "Mississauga Derailment" case), at pp. 65-66 [C.P.C.]. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts must not be lightly interfered with. The court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay, in the sense that it would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the process of the court in some other way. The stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff.

It is quite clear from *Empire-Universal Films Limited v. Rank*, [1947] O.R. 775 (H.C.) that McRuer C.J.H.C. considered that *The Judicature Act* [R.S.O. 1937, c. 100] then [and now the CJA] merely confirmed a statutory right that previously had been considered inherent in the jurisdiction of the court with respect to its authority to grant a stay of proceedings. See also *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) and *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60 (H.C.) at pp. 65-66.

15 Montgomery J. in *Canada Systems*, supra, at pp. 65-66 indicated:

Goodman J. (as he then was) in *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 in granting a stay reviewed the authorities and concluded that the inherent jurisdiction of the Court to grant a stay of proceedings may be made whenever it is just and reasonable to do so. "This court has ample jurisdiction to grant a stay whenever it is just and reasonable to do so." (Per Lord Denning M.R. in *Edmeades v. Thames Board Mills Ltd.*, [1969] 2 Q.B. 67 at 71, [1969] 2 All E.R. 127 (C.A.)). Lord Denning's decision in *Edmeades* was approved by Lord Justice Davies in *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach (Executor of Estate of George William Willis)*, [1972] 1 All E.R. 430, (sub nom. *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach*) [1972] 1 W.L.R. 326 (C.A.).

In *Weight Watchers Int. Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122, appeal allowed by consent without costs (sub nom. *Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd. v. Weight Watchers Inc. Inc.*) 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n, 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n (Fed. C.A.), Mr. Justice Heald on an application for stay said at p. 426 [25 D.L.R.]:

The principles which must govern in these matters are clearly stated in the case of *Empire Universal Films Ltd. et al. v. Rank et al.*, [1947] O.R. 775 at p. 779, as follows [quoting *St. Pierre et al. v. South American Stores (Gath & Chaves), Ltd. et al.*, [1936] 1 K.B. 382 at p. 398]:

(1.) A mere balance of convenience is not a sufficient ground for depriving a plaintiff of the advantages of prosecuting his action in an English Court if it is otherwise properly brought. The right of access to the King's Court must not be lightly refused. (2.) In order to justify a stay two conditions must be satisfied, one positive and the other negative: (a) the defendant must satisfy the Court that the continuance of the action would work an injustice because it would be oppressive or vexatious to him or would be an abuse of the process of the Court in some other way; and (b) the stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff. On both the burden of proof is on the defendant.

16 Thus it appears to me that the inherent power of this court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Is it appropriate to do so in the circumstances? Clearly there is jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants which are all companies which fit the criteria of the CCAA. However the stay requested also involved the limited partnerships to some degree either (i) with respect to the applicants acting on behalf of the Limited Partnerships or (ii) the stays being effective vis-à-vis any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertaking of the Limited Partnerships in respect of which they hold a direct interest (collectively the "Property") as set out in the terms of the stay provisions of the order paragraphs 4 through 18 inclusive attached as an appendix to these reasons. [Appendix omitted.] I believe that an analysis of the operations of a limited partnership in this context would be beneficial to an understanding of how there is a close inter-relationship to the applicants involved in this CCAA proceedings and

how the Limited Partnerships and their Property are an integral part of the operations previously conducted and the proposed restructuring.

17 A limited partnership is a creation of statute, consisting of one or more general partners and one or more limited partners. The limited partnership is an investment vehicle for passive investment by limited partners. It in essence combines the flow through concept of tax depreciation or credits available to "ordinary" partners under general partnership law with limited liability available to shareholders under corporate law. See Ontario LPA sections 2(2) and 3(1) and Lyle R. Hepburn, *Limited Partnerships*, (Toronto: De Boo, 1991), at p. 1-2 and p. 1-12. I would note here that the limited partnership provisions of the Alberta PA are roughly equivalent to those found in the Ontario LPA with the interesting side aspect that the Alberta legislation in s. 75 does allow for judgment against a limited partner to be charged against the limited partner's interest in the limited partnership. A general partner has all the rights and powers and is subject to all the restrictions and liabilities of a partner in a partnership. In particular a general partner is fully liable to each creditor of the business of the limited partnership. The general partner has sole control over the property and business of the limited partnership: see Ontario LPA ss. 8 and 13. Limited partners have no liability to the creditors of the limited partnership's business; the limited partners' financial exposure is limited to their contribution. The limited partners do not have any "independent" ownership rights in the property of the limited partnership. The entitlement of the limited partners is limited to their contribution plus any profits thereon, after satisfaction of claims of the creditors. See Ontario LPA sections 9, 11, 12(1), 13, 15(2) and 24. The process of debtor and creditor relationships associated with the limited partnership's business are between the general partner and the creditors of the business. In the event of the creditors collecting on debt and enforcing security, the creditors can only look to the assets of the limited partnership together with the assets of the general partner including the general partner's interest in the limited partnership. This relationship is recognized under the *Bankruptcy Act* (now the BIA) sections 85 and 142.

18 A general partner is responsible to defend proceedings against the limited partnership in the firm name, so in procedural law and in practical effect, a proceeding against a limited partnership is a proceeding against the general partner. See Ontario *Rules of Civil Procedure*, O. Reg. 560/84, Rules 8.01 and 8.02.

19 It appears that the preponderance of case law supports the contention that a partnership including a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. See *Lindley on Partnership*, 15th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1984), at pp. 33-35; *Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R.* (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137 (S.C.), affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) and "Extra-Provincial Liability of the Limited Partner", Brad A. Milne, (1985) 23 Alta. L. Rev. 345, at pp. 350-351. Milne in that article made the following observations:

The preponderance of case law therefore supports the contention that a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. It appears, nevertheless, that the distinction made in *Re Thorne* between partnerships and trade unions could not be applied to limited partnerships which, like trade unions, must rely on statute for their validity. The mere fact that limited partnerships owe their existence to the statutory provision is probably not sufficient to endow the limited partnership with the attribute of legal personality as suggested in *Ruzicks* unless it appeared that the Legislature clearly intended that the limited partnership should have a separate legal existence. A review of the various provincial statutes does not reveal any procedural advantages, rights or powers that are fundamentally different from those advantages enjoyed by ordinary partnerships. The legislation does not contain any provision resembling section 15 of the *Canada Business Corporation Act* [S.C. 1974-75, c. 33, as am.] which expressly states that a corporation has the capacity, both in and outside of Canada, of a natural person. It is therefore difficult to imagine that the Legislature intended to create a new category of legal entity.

20 It appears to me that the operations of a limited partnership in the ordinary course are that the limited partners take a completely passive role (they must or they will otherwise lose their limited liability protection which would have been their sole reason for choosing a limited partnership vehicle as opposed to an "ordinary" partnership vehicle). For a lively discussion of the question of "control" in a limited partnership as contrasted with shareholders in a corporation, see R. Flannigan, "The Control Test of Investor Liability in Limited Partnerships" (1983) 21 Alta. L. Rev. 303; E. Apps, "Limited Partnerships and the 'Control' Prohibition: Assessing the Liability of Limited Partners" (1991) 70 Can. Bar Rev. 611; R. Flannigan, "Limited Partner Liability: A Response" (1992) 71 Can. Bar Rev. 552. The limited partners leave the running of the business to the general partner and in that respect the care, custody and the maintenance of the property, assets and undertaking of the limited

partnership in which the limited partners and the general partner hold an interest. The ownership of this limited partnership property, assets and undertaking is an undivided interest which cannot be segregated for the purpose of legal process. It seems to me that there must be afforded a protection of the whole since the applicants' individual interest therein cannot be segregated without in effect dissolving the partnership arrangement. The limited partners have two courses of action to take if they are dissatisfied with the general partner or the operation of the limited partnership as carried on by the general partner — the limited partners can vote to (a) remove the general partner and replace it with another or (b) dissolve the limited partnership. However Flannigan strongly argues that an unfettered right to remove the general partner would attach general liability for the limited partners (and especially as to the question of continued enjoyment of favourable tax deductions) so that it is prudent to provide this as a conditional right: *Control Test*, (1992), supra, at pp. 524-525. Since the applicants are being afforded the protection of a stay of proceedings in respect to allowing them time to advance a reorganization plan and complete it if the plan finds favour, there should be a stay of proceedings (vis-à-vis any action which the limited partners may wish to take as to replacement or dissolution) through the period of allowing the limited partners to vote on the reorganization plan itself.

21 It seems to me that using the inherent jurisdiction of this court to supplement the statutory stay provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA would be appropriate in the circumstances; it would be just and reasonable to do so. The business operations of the applicants are so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for relief as to a stay to be granted to the applicants which would affect their business without at the same time extending that stay to the undivided interests of the limited partners in such. It also appears that the applicants are well on their way to presenting a reorganization plan for consideration and a vote; this is scheduled to happen within the month so there would not appear to be any significant time inconvenience to any person interested in pursuing proceedings. While it is true that the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim (as well as an interest of any other person), those who wish to be able to initiate or continue proceedings against the applicants may utilize the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain that particular stay. It seems to me that in such a comeback motion the onus would be upon the applicants to show that in the circumstances it was appropriate to continue the stay.

22 The order is therefore granted as to the relief requested including the proposed stay provisions.

Application allowed.

Footnotes

* As amended by the court.

TAB G

1984 CarswellAlta 973
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank and one other action

1984 CarswellAlta 973, 27 A.C.W.S. (2d) 97

**BETWEEN: MERIDIAN DEVELOPMENTS INC., Applicant, - and
TORONTO-DOMINION BANK, Respondent. AND BETWEEN: MERIDIAN
DEVELOPMENTS INC.. Plaintiff, - and NU-WEST GROUP LTD.. Defendant.**

Wachowich J

Judgment: May 11, 1984

Docket: None given.

Counsel: Counsel: A. Z. Breitman & J. G. Shea for Meridian Developments Ltd. J. L. MacPherson, Q.C. & K. Martens for Toronto-Dominion Bank. P., Owen, Q.C. & Ms. C. Bodner, for Nu-West Group Ltd.

Subject: Contracts

Wachowich J:

The applicant Meridian Developments Inc. (hereinafter called Meridian) is an Alberta corporation which has recently been continued under the [Alberta Business Corporations Act](#).

Previously it was known as Meridian Developments Ltd. and it was in that name that Meridian sold land by agreement for sale to 233995 Alberta Ltd. on March 16, 1981. Nu-West Group Ltd. (hereinafter called Nu-West) is the beneficial owner of all of the shares of 233995 Alberta Ltd. and on March 16, 1981 executed under seal an unconditional guarantee in favour of Meridian Developments Ltd. whereby Nu-West unconditionally guaranteed to Meridian the amounts due from 233995 Alberta Ltd. at the times and in the manner set forth in the agreement for sale.

2 It was a term of the guarantee that if default occurred under the agreement, Nu-West would forthwith on demand pay all of the purchase monies owed.

3 By clause 5 of this guarantee it was agreed that Meridian would not be bound to exhaust other resources or to act on other securities before proceeding against Nu-West.

4 On March 15, 1983, 233995 Alberta Ltd. defaulted on the agreement for sale. On March 18, 1983 demand was made to Nu-West as was required under the terms of the guarantee.

5 Nu-West failed to pay the amount owing on demand and thereafter, Meridian issued a statement of claim on March 31, 1983. Nu-West did not defend this action and, as a result, Meridian obtained default judgment on May 3, 1983 in the amount of \$928,989.33 plus costs. A writ of Execution was duly filed on May 11, 1983 and Meridian instructed the sheriff to seize sufficient assets of Nu-West to satisfy the judgment. seizure of a number of pieces of furniture and office machines was effected on May 16, 1983.

6 Nu-West then made application by notice of motion for a declaration that Meridian was not at liberty to make execution against Nu-West until it had sold the land in question because of the provisions of [sections 40\(2\) and 40\(3\) of the Law of Property Act](#). R.S.A. 1980. c. L-8. This application was dismissed by order of Kirby, J. on May 24, 1983. Part of the debt was then paid but execution on the balance of \$463,329.33 was stayed pending Nu-West's appeal of Kirby, J.'s order.

The stay of execution granted was subject to the following conditions:

1. That Nu-West post an irrevocable letter of credit issued by the Toronto-Dominion Bank in favour of Meridian Developments Ltd. in the amount of the unpaid balance of \$463,239.33 with interest at 11-1/2% per annum calculated thereon from May 4, 1983 to the date of payment.
2. That Meridian's solicitors were to hold the letter on the trust conditions imposed in correspondence from solicitors for the defendant to the solicitors for the plaintiff dated June 6, 1983.
3. That the defendant would promptly prosecute the appeal of the order.

7 The appeal was subsequently launched on June 20, 1983 and heard on October 12, 1983. The appeal was dismissed with written reasons on March 29, 1984.

8 The irrevocable letter of credit was held in trust by solicitors for Meridian throughout the period between Kirby, J.'s first order and the dismissal of the appeal. During this period several new orders were made by consent each of which had the effect of continuing the terms and conditions of the original order. The amount of the letter of credit was increased during this period in order to account for the interest on the principal which accrued during the period. The order that was in effect when the decision of the Court of Appeal was released was made by Hetherington, J. on January 30, 1984.

9 The letter of credit would have probably been honoured on presentation after March 29 were it not for the *ex parte* order obtained from myself by Nu-West under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1970, C. C-25 as am.* This order was made as a result of Nu-West's insolvency and provided, *inter alia*, in clause 2 that"

"further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the Petitioner be restrained until July 31, 1984"

and in clause 3 that:

"until July 31, 1984 no suit, action, or other proceeding be proceeded with or commenced against the Petitioner, except with leave of this Court".

As a result of the Bank's knowledge of this order, it has not honoured the letter of credit and has, instead, brought interpleader proceedings.

10 Meridian has brought action against the Bank alleging breach of contract in their failure to honour the letter of credit.

11 Application for advice and directions was also made by Meridian to entitle them to present the letter of credit for payment and to determine that my order of March 21, 1984 does not enjoin and restrain Meridian from presenting the letter of credit or the Bank from honouring it.

12 From this the following issues come before me in this application:

1. Is payment of the letter of credit a "proceeding" within the meaning of clause 2 or 3 of the March 21 order?
2. If so, is it a proceeding "against the Petitioner" [Nu-West] so as to be restrained by clause 2 or 3 of that order.
3. If it is found to be a "proceeding" should the court in any case give leave to Meridian in the circumstances to obtain payment of the letter of credit?

13 These are difficult issues to resolve as counsel agree that the law in the area is unclear and the cases cannot all be reconciled. Further, there are good policy arguments to be made for both sides.

14 In order to resolve the issues raised in this application I must consider the scope and intent of my March 21 *ex parte* order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. This Act, though little used, is one of a number of federal statutes dealing with insolvency. In common with the various other statutes. it envisages the protection of creditors and the orderly administration of the debtor's affairs or assets: *Wynden Canada Inc. v. Gaz Metrolopitain Inc.*, 44 C.B.R. 285 (C.S. Que.). In the words of Duff, C.J.C. who spoke for the court in the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act Reference Case*, C.B.R. 1 (S.C.C.) at p.2:

"the aim of the Act is to deal with the existing condition of insolvency in itself to enable arrangements to be made in view of the insolvent condition of the company under judicial authority which, otherwise, might not be valid prior to the initiation of proceedings in bankruptcy. *Ex facie* it would appear that such a scheme in principle does not radically depart from the normal character of bankruptcy legislation"

15 The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allows a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is. hopefully. the future benefit of both the company and its creditors.

16 This aim is facilitated by s.11 of the Act which enables the court to:

"restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company upon such terms as the court sees fit, and the court may also make an order that no suit. action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes."

It was pursuant to this section that on March 21 I granted the order that restrained "further proceedings in any action. suit, or proceeding" against Nu-West and enjoined creditors and others from proceeding with or commencing any "suit, action. or proceeding".

17 This order is in accord with the general aim of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. The intention was to prevent any maneuvers for positioning among creditors during the interim period which would give the aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who were less aggressive and would further undermine the financial position of the company making it less likely that the eventual arrangement would succeed.

18 The order was obviously intended to cast a wide net and catch all creditors. Therefore Meridian can only succeed if it can establish that the payment of the letter of credit is not a "proceeding,, against Nu-West as contemplated by the order.

19 As both counsel have frankly admitted, there are no cases directly on point. One of the few cases which does deal with the meaning of the word "proceeding" in the *Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act* is *Gray v. Wentworth Canning Co. Ltd.*, 31 C.B.R. 182. a decision of the Manitoba Court of King's Bench. In that case Kelly, J. determined that the relevant statute section gave the court complete discretion to determine the kinds of proceedings it would restrain. Although because of the wording in the particular order there at issue. Kelly, J. determined that it was meant to catch only proceedings. suits. or actions which had not yet been instituted. it is clear from his judgment that he sees the section as allowing orders of much wider range. He points out. in fact, that it is because the draftsman of the order did not see fit to follow the exact words of what was then s.10 of the Act. that the order as given must be seen as restraining only those proceedings Commenced after the order was given.

20 A similar provision to s.11 may be found in the English *Companies Act*, 1862, s.85 which allowed a court at any time after the presentation of a winding-up petition to:

"restrain further proceedings in any action. suit. or proceeding against the company upon such terms as the court sees fit. and the court may also make an order that no suit. action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes."

21 Several cases which have interpreted this provision are useful in determining the scope of the term "proceeding". Jessel, M.R. in *Re Artistic Colour Printing Co.*, XIV Ch. 502 determined that an order made under this section could restrain the sheriff from selling goods already in his possession after seizure on the judgment of a judgment creditor. At p.505 he concluded:

"The word 'proceeding, in both sections of course includes execution under a judgment in an action."

In *Re Perkins Beach Lead Mining Co.* VII Ch. 371 is to the same effect.

22 Counsel for Meridian admits that "proceeding" may have a very general meaning but submits that we must confine ourselves here to proceedings which necessarily involve a court or a court official. There is certainly authority for this Proposition. *Black's Law Dictionary* (5th ed.) defines the term in the following manner:

"Proceeding. In a general sense, the form and manner of conducting juridical business before a court or judicial officer. Regular and orderly progress in form of law, including all possible steps in an action from its commencement to the execution of judgment. Term also refers to administrative proceedings before agencies, tribunals, bureaus, or the like.

An act which is done by the authority or direction of the court, agency or tribunal, express or implied; an act necessary to be done in order to obtain a given end; a prescribed mode of action for carrying into effect a legal right. All the steps or measures adopted in the prosecution or defense of an action. *Statter v. United States*. C.C.A. Alaska, 66 F.2d 819. 822. The word may be used synonymously with 'action, or 'suit' to describe the entire course of an action at law or suit in equity from the issuance of the writ or filing of the complaint until the entry of a final judgment, or may be used to describe any act done by authority of a court of law and every step required to be taken in any cause by either party. The proceedings of a suit embrace *all* matters that occur in its progress judicially.

Term 'proceeding' may refer not only to a complete remedy but also to a mere procedural step that is part of a larger action or special proceeding. *Rooney v. Vermont Investment Corp.*, 10 Cal.3d 351, 110 Cal.Rptr. 353, 365. 515 P.2d 297. A 'proceeding' includes action and special proceedings before judicial tribunals as well as proceedings pending before quasi-judicial officers and boards. *State ex rel. Johnson v. Independent School Dist. No. 810, Wabasha County*. 260 Minn. 237, 109 N.W.2d 596, 602."

Words and Phrases Legally Defined (2d ed.) Vol. 4 similarly restricts the definition to actions before a court or other judicial body:

"Proceedings

The term 'proceeding' is frequently used to note a step in an action, and obviously it has that meaning in such phrases as 'proceeding in any cause or matter,. When used alone, however. it is in certain statutes to be construed as synonymous with, or including action' (1 Halsbury's Laws (3rd Edn.) 5, 6).

By s.89 of the Judicature Act of 1873 [repealed; see now Supreme Court of Judicature (Consolidation) Act 1925, s.202] . . . it is said that every inferior court 'shall, as regards all causes of action within its jurisdiction for the time being, have power to grant and shall grant in any proceeding before such Court. such relief, redress. or remedy' in as full and ample a manner as might and ought to be done in the like case by the High Court of justice. . . . It can do so in any proceeding'. Now what is the meaning there of 'in any proceeding'? . . . Now, although if s.89 stood by itself, there might be some difficulty in determining what is the meaning of the word 'proceeding', yet it seems to me to be clear what is its meaning in s.90 [repealed; see now Supreme Court of Judicature (Consolidation) Act 1925. s.203], and that 'proceeding, in that section is a general word meant to cover every step in an action. and is equivalent to the word 'action'." *Pryor v. City Offices Co.* (1883), 10 Q.B.D. 504, C.A., per Brett, M.R.. at pp. 507. 508.

Anything that precedes the final judgment or order is, in my opinion, a 'proceeding' in the action. *Blake v. Summersby*, [1889] W.N. 39, per Kay, J. at p.39."

23 Although this last mentioned definition indicated *Blake v. Summerby*, [1889] W.N. 39 restricts the proceedings to steps in an action preceding judgment. there is ample authority, cited by both counsel, to indicate that the term must be taken to include execution steps taken after judgment. As I indicated. earlier, counsel for Meridian would restrict "execution proceedings" to those involving a court or court official. Those cases cited by Nu-West which indicate that an order restraining proceedings,

restrains a sheriff from conducting a sale following seizure I am satisfied are in accord with this view inasmuch as the sheriff is an officer of the court. Further, counsel for Meridian cites *Canadian Credit Mens' Trust Association v. City of Edmonton*, [1925] 1 W.W.R. 747 where the Alberta Appellate Division found that a distress was not a "process against property" within the meaning of s.11 of the *Bankruptcy Act*, 1919, c.36. He also cites another Alberta Appellate Division decision, that of *Lee v. Armstrong*, [1970] 3 W.W.R. 889 where the court found that the noting on the title by the Registrar of a writ of execution was not a "proceeding" within the meaning of the phrase "no proceeding shall be had or taken in respect of any execution already issued on a personal judgment . . . until the sale of the land mortgage" as found in the *Land Titles Act*, 1906 (Alta.), c.24, S.62(a) *as am.*

24 Meridian argues further on the basis of the *ejusdem generis* rule that the interpretation of "other proceeding" in s.11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* is limited to proceedings which would fall within the genus indicated by the words "suit" and "action". This, too, indicates that the term as used in the Act ought to be restricted to proceedings which necessarily involve either a court or court official.

25 These arguments are persuasive. Nonetheless, I am mindful of the wide scope of action which Parliament intended for this section of the Act. To narrow the interpretation of "proceeding" could lessen the ability of a court to restrain a creditor from acting to prejudice an eventual arrangement in the interim when other creditors are being consulted. As I indicated earlier, it is necessary to give this section a wide interpretation in order to ensure its effectiveness. I hesitate therefore to restrict the term "proceedings" to those necessarily involving a court or court official because there are situations in which to do so would allow non-judicial proceedings to go against the creditor which would effectively prejudice other creditors and make effective arrangement impossible. The restriction could thus defeat the purpose of the Act. I must consider, for instance, the fact that it may still be possible to make distress without requiring a sheriff or his bailiff, as for example, on a chattel mortgage. It might well be necessary to find that such a distress constitutes a "proceeding" in terms of s.11 in some future situations. As a result, in the absence of a clear indication from Parliament of an intention to restrict "proceedings" to "proceedings which involve either a court or court official", I cannot find that the term should be so restricted. Had Parliament intended to so restrict the term, it would have been easy to qualify it by saying for instance "proceedings before a court or tribunal".

26 Nor is there anything within the provisions of the order given on March 21 to indicate any intention to so limit the meaning of the word. I conclude, therefore, that payment of a letter of credit drawn on the account of an insolvent company could well come within the meaning of the word "proceeding" in the Order.

27 Here we are dealing with a payment which remains contingent at the date of the Order. It awaited the judgment of the Court of Appeal on March 21 and thus, did involve a court or court official. Even if, therefore, I were to accept that payment of a letter of credit is not a proceeding under the Act, it seems clear that a payment which awaits a decision of the court is a proceeding as contemplated by the Act.

28 It Must be noted, however, that by the terms of the March 21, 1984 order it is only "further proceedings in any action, suit, or proceeding against the Petitioner" that are restrained. Unless the payment of the letter of credit is a "proceeding against the Petitioner" (Nu-West) it was not restrained by this order. I agree with counsel for Meridian that the payment of the letter of credit cannot be termed a proceeding against Nu-West unless the money to be paid is Nu-West's property.

29 The ownership of the funds represented by the letter of credit is dependent upon the judicial nature of the commercial instrument in question. The nature of a letter of credit has been extensively considered. Halsbury (4th ed.) states at para. 132 of volume 3 that letters of credit:

"create a binding contract to accept or pay bills on the specified conditions, enforceable against the banker by any person to whom the letter has been shown by the grantee, and who has acted on the faith of it."

In para. 133 the authors continue:

"The contract thus created between the seller and the banker is separate from, although ancillary to, the original contract between the buyer and the seller, by reason of the banker's undertaking to the seller, which is absolute."

30 The nature of a letter of credit has been explored in both English and Canadian cases. In *Aspen Planners Ltd. v. Commerce Masonry and Forming Ltd. et al*, 7 B.L.R. 102 at 107. Henry. J. quotes with approval from the English Court of Appeal in *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd. v. Barclay's Bank International Ltd.*, [1978] 1 All E.R. 976 (C.A.) at p.981:

"... it seems to be plain that the opening of a confirmed letter of credit constitutes a bargain between the banker and the vendor of the goods, which imposes on the banker an absolute obligation to pay, irrespective of any dispute which there may be between the parties on the question whether the goods are up to the contract or not. An elaborate commercial system has been built up on the footing that bankers' confirmed credits are of that character, and, in my judgment it would be wrong for this court in the present case to interfere with that established practice."

Aspen Planners Ltd., *supra*, deals with a situation in which the plaintiffs arranged irrevocable letters of credit to a contractor to ensure payment of a building contract. They later alleged that the contractor had defaulted on the contract and sought to obtain an injunction restraining payment under the letter of credit. The Ontario Court refused citing the irrevocable nature of the bank's obligation to pay the contractor.

31 This case, as do the English cases cited by counsel, exemplifies the more traditional use of the letter to guarantee payment in commercial transactions where goods and services are bought and sold.

32 Here, however, a more novel use has been made of the letter of credit as a security device and to determine whether this use affects the nature of the document we must turn to the American cases where the use of letters of credit, particularly in the way one was used here, is much more prevalent.

33 The nature of a letter of credit was explored in numerous cases relied upon by counsel for Meridian. *East Girard Savings Association v. Citizens National Bank and Trust Co. of Bagtown*, 593 F.2d 598, a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit sets out the nature of the letter of credit at p.601:

"... a letter of credit typically involves three separate contracts. First, the issuing bank enters into a contract with its customer to issue the letter of credit. Second, there is a contract between the issuing bank and the party receiving the letter of credit. Third, the customer who procured the letter of credit signs a contract with the person receiving it, usually involving the sale of goods or the provision of some service. *Barclays Bank D.C.O. v. Mercantile National Bank*, 481 F.2d 1224, 1239 n.21 (5th Cir. 1973). cert. dismissed, 414 U.S. 1139, 94 S.Ct. 888, 39 L.Ed.2d 96 (1974), Verkuil, *supra*, 25 Stan.L.Rev. at 719.

In recent years, letters of credit have been used for a variety of commercial transactions, Harfield, *The Increasing Domestic Use of the Letter*, 4 U.C.C.L.J. 251 (1972). The guaranty letter of credit is one of these recent innovations. The guaranty letter of credit is designed to ensure that one or more parties to a contract will perform their duties under it. in a typical guaranty situation, the future owner of a building requires that the building contractor give him a completion bond providing for the payment of a certain sum of money if the building is not completed on schedule.

At p.602 the court continues:

"Regardless of which form of letter of credit is used, upon compliance with the conditions contained in the letter, the recipient is entitled to full payment. This entitlement is independent of collateral obligations which may exist under the other underlying contracts. *Pringle-Associated Mortgage Corp.*, *supra*, 571 F.2d at 874; *Barclays Bank*, *supra* 481 F.2d at 1238-39; 2 Tex.Bus. & COM.Code."

At P.603 the court concludes:

"If the letter of credit is to retain its utility as a commercial instrument, the rights and duties of the issuer, the beneficiary, and the procurer must remain clear. Parties to commercial transactions must be able to rely on the fact that as soon as the conditions, contained in a particular letter are satisfied, payment is due."

34 This case, and others cited by counsel for Meridian, clearly indicate that the nature of a letter of credit has not been changed by its use in a greater variety of commercial transactions, notably as a guarantee. It exists as an independent contract between the bank and the person cashing or negotiating the draft and, if it is irrevocable, the bank is bound to honour it.

35 Because of the independent contractual nature of a letter of credit, the analogy which Nu-West attempts to make between money held in court following seizure and a letter of credit cannot be maintained. Money paid into court may well remain the property of the defendants as the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal determined in *Regina Steam Laundry Ltd. v. Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office at al* (1971) 1 W.W.R. 96 although I note that there is also authority to the contrary *Exp. Banner, In re Keyworth*. IX Ch. 379, *Re Hansard Spruce Mills Ltd.* (1954] 1 D.L.R. 326. Security in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit is not the property of the party arranging the letter of credit. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that it has never been his money. He has contracted with his bank to require the bank to pay out a specific amount of money to a third party on the occurrence of certain events. In return he has promised to repay the bank for the funds so expended. The customer of the bank has, in my view, never had ownership, of any funds represented by the letter of credit. He can lay claim only to the debt that has been thereby created.

36 Thus, it is my view that even if the payment out of a letter of credit could be termed a "proceeding": as this term is used in s.11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, it cannot be termed "a proceeding against the Petitioner" so as to be caught by the order of March 21.

37 I am fortified in my view by a recent unreported American case cited by Meridian which seems right on point. The case is *Page v. First National Bank of Maryland*, unreported. U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, March 30, 1982.

38 The facts are very similar to those found here. Westinghouse Credit Corporation (W.C.C.) was the beneficiary of a letter of credit drawn on the First National Bank of Maryland (Bank). The Bank was enjoined from payment out on this letter after Page and Associates, a limited partnership and Virginia Page (Page) its sole general partner, filed voluntary petitions in bankruptcy. W.C.C. was a substantial creditor of Page, holding among its forms of security the letter of credit issued on the Bank. W.C.C. presented its letter of credit for payment four days after the petition was filed. Page sought an injunction the next day which was granted on the ground that to pay the letter would be a transfer in violation of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. s.362(3) or (4). These subsections provide:

" [A] petition [under Title 11] operates as a stay, applicable to all entities, of -

...

(3) any act to obtain possession of property of the estate or of property from the estate;

(4) any act to create, perfect or enforce any lien against property of the estate."

W.C.C. appealed the decision to grant the injunction and this appeal was allowed. The Court found that cashing the letter of credit was not the type of act contemplated by the provisions of the statute since neither the letter of credit nor its proceeds are the "property of the estate" under the Bankruptcy Code.

39 At P.4 of the decision the Court stated:

"In issuing the letter of credit the Bank entered into an independent contractual obligation to pay WCC out of its own assets. Although cashing the letter will immediately give rise to a claim by the Bank against the debtors pursuant to the latter's indemnification obligations, that claim will not divest the debtors of any property since any attempt to enforce that claim would be subject to an automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. para. 362(4)."

40 In my view the Toronto-Dominion Bank is in the same position. It is obliged to honour its contract with Meridian even though the cashing of the letter of credit will increase Nu-West's debt to the bank and even though the Bank has no method of enforcing its claim against Nu-West because of the March 21 Order.

41 It makes no difference that the letter of credit was held in trust by Meridian's solicitors and that the condition precedent for presentation had not been met on March 21. If the monies secured were not Nu-West property on March 21, the order did not affect them. The letter of credit became negotiable when the condition precedent was fulfilled on March 29 with the rendering of the Court of Appeal's decision in Meridian's favour. The Bank should be directed to honour it on presentation on the terms and conditions specified in the letter and it is so ordered.

"Signed"

42 J. Q. B.

DATED at Edmonton, Alberta,

this 11th day of May, 1984.

TAB H

2018 SKCA 36
Saskatchewan Court of Appeal

Industrial Properties Regina Limited v. Copper Sands Land Corp.

2018 CarswellSask 252, 2018 SKCA 36, 292 A.C.W.S. (3d) 479, 422 D.L.R. (4th) 749, 61 C.B.R. (6th) 38

Industrial Properties Regina Limited (Appellant / Respondent) And Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JLL Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp. (Respondents / Applicants)

101297277 Saskatchewan Ltd. (Appellant / Respondent) And Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JLL Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp. (Respondents / Applicants)

Affinity Credit Union 2013 (Appellant / Respondent) and Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JLL Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp. (Respondents / Applicants)

Herauf, Ryan-Froslic, Schwann JJ.A.

Heard: March 5, 2018

Judgment: May 23, 2018*

Docket: CACV3176, CACV3177, CACV3178

Counsel: Diana K. Lee, Q.C., Alexander Shalashniy, for Industrial Properties Regina Ltd.

Rick Van Beselaere, Q.C., for 101297277 Saskatchewan Ltd.

Ryan A. Pederson, for Affinity Credit Union

Jeffery M. Lee, Q.C., Paul Olfert, for Respondents

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.4 Appeals](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Appeals

Debtors operated trailer park — Debtors' assets were comprised of undeveloped lands, lands that housed trailer park and incomplete water and waste treatment facility — Debtors owed secured creditors amount of \$10.7 million — Debtors sought protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#) following initiation of foreclosure proceedings and obtained initial order staying creditor enforcement for 30 days, authorizing of \$1.25 million in interim financing for ongoing costs, cost of [CCAA](#) proceedings, and completion of commissioning of water treatment utility — Sale approval and vesting order was granted in respect of undeveloped lands — Secured creditors were granted leave to appeal on issue of whether it was appropriate to grant initial order for [CCAA](#) protection and \$1.25 million in interim financing — Appeal by secured creditors — Appeal allowed in part — Evidence supported findings that appropriate circumstances and reasonable possibility of restructuring existed, and that debtors acted in good faith and with due diligence — Chambers judge appropriately considered secured creditors' lack of confidence in viability of debtors' plan — Judge erred in permitting debtors to obtain \$1.25 million in interim financing as part of initial order without consideration of mandatory factors enumerated in [s. 11.2\(4\) of CCAA](#), particularly whether loan would enhance prospects of viable compromise or arrangement given secured creditors' steadfast opposition to further

financing — There was no evidence of urgent circumstances justifying interim financing — Nature of debtors' business did not require interim financing to continue operation — There was no evidence of how commissioning of water treatment facility would contribute to viable restructuring of debtors — Part of initial order related to interim financing was set aside *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s 11.2(4).

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Herauf J.A.*:

Alberta Treasury Branches v. Conserve Oil 1st Corp. (2016), 2016 ABCA 87, 2016 CarswellAlta 548, 35 C.B.R. (6th) 6 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Alberta Treasury Branches v. Tallgrass Energy Corp (2013), 2013 ABQB 432, 2013 CarswellAlta 1496, 8 C.B.R. (6th) 161 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Forest & Marine Financial Corp., Re (2009), 2009 BCCA 319, 2009 CarswellBC 1738, 54 C.B.R. (5th) 201, [2009] 9 W.W.R. 567, 96 B.C.L.R. (4th) 77, 273 B.C.A.C. 271, 461 W.A.C. 271 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Hush Homes Inc., Re (2015), 2015 ONSC 370, 2015 CarswellOnt 558, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 67 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Matco Capital Ltd. v. Interex Oilfield Services Ltd. (August 1, 2006), Doc. 0601-08395 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re (2005), 2005 BCCA 192, 2005 CarswellBC 705, 7 M.P.L.R. (4th) 153, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 278, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 210 B.C.A.C. 247, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 348 W.A.C. 247 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1990 CarswellOnt 139 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Pacific Shores Resort & Spa Ltd., Re (2011), 2011 BCSC 1775, 2011 CarswellBC 3500, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 248 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Redstone Investment Corp., Re (2014), 2014 ONSC 2004, 2014 CarswellOnt 5119 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Rimmer v. Adshead (2002), 2002 SKCA 12, 2002 CarswellSask 19, [2002] 4 W.W.R. 119, 24 R.F.L. (5th) 159, 217 Sask. R. 94, 265 W.A.C. 94 (Sask. C.A.) — followed

Stomp Pork Farm Ltd., Re (2008), 2008 SKCA 73, 2008 CarswellSask 358, 43 C.B.R. (5th) 42, [2008] 8 W.W.R. 607, 311 Sask. R. 186, 428 W.A.C. 186 (Sask. C.A.) — considered

Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re (2010), 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, 409 N.R. 201, (sub nom. *Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd., Re*) 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (A.G.)*) [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 296 B.C.A.C. 1, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 503 W.A.C. 1 (S.C.C.) — considered

York (Regional Municipality) v. Thornhill Green Co-Operative Homes Inc. (2010), 2010 ONCA 393, 2010 CarswellOnt 3658, 262 O.A.C. 232, 94 R.P.R. (4th) 1, 68 C.B.R. (5th) 73 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.02(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(2) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.2(2) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(3) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(3)(a) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(3)(b) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.2(4)(a) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered

s. 11.2(4)(d) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered

s. 13 — referred to

s. 14(1) — referred to

s. 36 — considered

APPEAL by secured creditors from initial order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Herauf J.A.:

I. INTRODUCTION

1 The respondents are six corporations, all of which are owned and controlled by one individual. The appellants represent the secured creditors of one or more of the respondents. On December 20, 2017, the respondents were granted an initial order, a sale approval and vesting order and access to interim financing pursuant to the [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, RSC 1985, c C-36 \[CCAA\]](#). The appellants appealed those orders to this Court. The appeal was heard on March 5, 2018. On March 9, 2018, the Court allowed the appeal in part with more extensive written reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

II. BACKGROUND FACTS

2 The assets of the respondents consist of a trailer park (Copper Sands Trailer Park) and an incomplete water treatment and waste water treatment facility located on lands owned by the respondents, and undeveloped lands known as the Willow Rush property. The Copper Sands Trailer Park is the respondents' only functioning business and has two employees.

3 As of November 2017, the respondents owed the appellants, collectively, in excess of \$10,725,000. When the appellant, Affinity Credit Union, commenced foreclosure proceedings, the respondents applied pursuant to the [CCAA](#), seeking the following relief, *inter alia*:

(a) an initial order staying creditor enforcement to facilitate the companies' restructurings, including the sale of Willow Rush; and

(b) an order authorizing interim financing up to \$1.25 million with a priority charge, to enable it to complete the water treatment facility.

4 On November 15, 2017, the parties argued the matter before a Chambers judge. The appellants firmly opposed the relief sought by the respondents, challenging the appropriateness of [CCAA](#) proceedings in the circumstances. The appellants were skeptical of the legitimacy of the Willow Rush sale and questioned whether the water treatment facility was capable of completion and, if so, whether it could produce viable capital. Due to these concerns, amongst others, the appellants opposed the initial order and the interim financing, stressing the prejudice the creditors would suffer if these orders were granted.

5 After hearing submissions, the Chambers judge concluded the respondents' application was premature and adjourned the matter to enable the respondents to confirm the validity of the Willow Rush sale and to file additional material relating to completion of the water treatment facility ((21 November 2017) Saskatoon, QBG 1693/2017 (Sask CA) [*November fiat*]).

6 The matter was returned to the Court of Queen's Bench on December 11, 2017. At that time, in addition to the application for an initial order and interim financing, the respondents asked the Chambers judge to grant sale approval and a vesting order pursuant to s. 36 of the CCAA, to facilitate the sale of the Willow Rush property.

7 In his fiat ((20 December 2017) Saskatoon, QBG 1693/2017 (Sask CA) [*December fiat*]), the Chambers judge granted the respondents' applications. The Chambers judge granted the initial order, imposing a stay of creditor enforcement for 30 days, authorized \$1.25 million interim financing, \$800,000 of which was to be used to "complete the commissioning of the water treatment utility", \$337,500 for the cost of the CCAA proceedings, and \$112,500 for "ongoing costs", and granted the sale approval and vesting order. The vesting order was set to expire on January 12, 2018, if the proposed sale did not close.

8 Pursuant to ss. 13 and 14(1) of the CCAA, the appellants sought leave from this Court to appeal the initial order, the interim financing and the sale approval and vesting order. Before leave was granted and before the expiry of the vesting order, the Willow Rush sale closed for the asking price of \$4.2 million. For this reason, leave to appeal relating to the sale and vesting order were denied. Leave was granted on the issue of whether it was appropriate to grant the initial order for CCAA protection and to grant \$1.25 million interim financing.

9 On March 9, 2018, the Court concluded the Chambers judge had erred in granting the interim financing and the appeal related to that aspect of the matter was allowed. The appeal relating to the appropriateness of the initial order was dismissed.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

10 Decisions made pursuant to the CCAA are highly discretionary and attract deference from this Court. In *Stomp Pork Farm Ltd., Re*, 2008 SKCA 73, 311 Sask. R. 186 (Sask. C.A.) [*Stomp Pork*], Jackson J.A. articulated the Court's general reluctance to intervene in CCAA matters, noting the familiarly CCAA judges have with the different parties involved and the Chambers judge's meaningful understanding of the circumstances:

[25] The Court recognizes that there is a general reluctance on behalf of appellate courts to intervene in decisions taken by restructuring judges in CCAA matters. The mix of business and legal decisions made in real time can make it difficult to say, after the fact and with any degree of precision, that one particular decision would have been better than another. Further, the Court is hesitant to elevate a decision in one restructuring to a principle of law that will hamper the appropriate exercise of discretion in another. ...

11 Although appellate courts exercise their right of review sparingly, CCAA decisions are not immune from appellate intervention. Judges making CCAA orders must exercise their discretion judiciously, which requires considering relevant factors and reaching a legally correct conclusion: *Stomp Pork* at para 27; *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192B.C. C.A. at para 26, [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224 (B.C. C.A.). As Dr. Janis P. Sara explains, appellate courts will intervene in limited circumstances:

Appellate courts will accord a high degree of deference when asked to interfere with the exercise of authority of a CCAA court. At the same time, discretionary decisions are not immune from review if the appellate court reaches the clear conclusion that there has been a wrongful exercise of authority or there is a fundamental question of the lower court's jurisdiction.

(*Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2d ed (Toronto: Carswell, 2013) at 181)

12 In *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379 (S.C.C.) [*Century Services*], the Supreme Court discussed a court's wide discretion in CCAA matters. The Supreme Court explained that this judicial discretion must be exercised in furtherance of the legislation's remedial purposes:

[59] Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the CCAA's purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 57, per Doherty J.A., dissenting)

13 The standard of review with respect to the exercise of judicial discretion, such as in *CCAA* matters, is set out in *Rimmer v. Adsheed*, 2002 SKCA 12 (Sask. C.A.) at para 58, (2002), 217 Sask. R. 94 (Sask. C.A.):

... [T]he powers in issue are discretionary and therefore fall to be exercised as the judge vested with them thinks fit, having regard for such criteria as bear upon their proper exercise. The discretion is that of the judge of first instance, not ours. Hence, our function, at least at the outset, is one of review only: review to determine if, in light of such criteria, the judge abused his or her discretion. Did the judge err in principle, disregard a material matter of fact, or fail to act judicially? Only if some such failing is present are we free to override the decision of the judge and do as we think fit. Either that, or the result must be so plainly wrong as to amount to an injustice and invite intervention on that basis. ...

14 Applying this standard of review, we see no merit to the appellants' argument that the Chambers judge erred in granting the initial order. However, we are of the opinion the Chambers judge failed to consider the mandatory factors enumerated in s. 11.2(4) of the *CCAA* prior to granting the interim financing. This error resulted in a wrongful exercise of discretion given the preliminary nature of the *CCAA* proceedings.

IV. THE INITIAL ORDER

15 The first formal step in *CCAA* proceedings is the debtor company applying to the court for an initial order. The terms of initial orders are provided for in ss. 11.02(1) and (3) of the *CCAA*:

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

...

(3) *The court shall not make the order unless*

(a) *the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and*

(b) *in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.*

(Emphasis added)

16 The purpose of the initial order is to stay creditor enforcement in order to maintain the debtor corporation's "status quo" for a specified and limited period so that it may develop a plan to be presented to creditors for their consideration. The initial order

staying creditor enforcement provides the debtor corporation some breathing room to allow it to prepare, file and seek approval from creditors and ultimately the courts of its proposed plan: *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* at 31.

17 Pursuant to ss. 11.02(1) and (3), the court may grant an initial order staying creditor enforcement for a term not exceeding 30 days, if the applicant satisfies the court that the appropriate circumstances exist and that it is acting in good faith and with due diligence.

A. Appropriate circumstances

18 In *Century Services*, the Supreme Court discussed the remedial objectives of the *CCAA* and explained that "appropriate circumstances" exist when an order advances these remedial objectives by providing the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize:

[60] Judicial decision making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed. ...

...

[70] ... Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. *The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. ...

(Emphasis added)

19 The evidentiary burden the debtor corporation must satisfy to establish "appropriate circumstances" for the purposes of a 30-day stay order is not exceptionally onerous: *Alberta Treasury Branches v. Tallgrass Energy Corp*, 2013 ABQB 432 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 14, 20138 C.B.R. (6th) 161 (Alta. Q.B.) [*Alberta Treasury*]; *Matco Capital Ltd. v. Interex Oilfield Services Ltd.* (August 1, 2006), Doc. 0601-08395 (Alta. Q.B.) [*Matco*]; *Hush Homes Inc., Re*, 2015 ONSC 370 (Ont. S.C.J. at paras 51-53, 201522 C.B.R. (6th) 67 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Redstone Investment Corp., Re*, 2014 ONSC 2004 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras 49-50.

20 As the Supreme Court noted in *Century Services*, initial *CCAA* orders are made in the "hothouse of real-time litigation" (at para 58). The debtor corporation is often in crisis-mode due to its failure to meet creditor obligations and is seeking *CCAA* protection to obtain some breathing room to enable it to get its affairs in order without creditors knocking at the door. Therefore, to obtain an initial 30-day order, the applicant is not required to prove it has a "feasible plan" but merely "a germ of a plan": *Alberta Treasury* at para 14. The court must assess whether the circumstances are such that, with the initial order, the debtor corporation has a "reasonable possibility of restructuring": *Matco*. To require the applicant corporation to present a fully-developed restructuring plan or have the support of all its creditors at the initial stage of *CCAA* proceedings, although desirable, is not expected. To impose such a threshold to establish "appropriate circumstances" would unduly hinder the purpose of an initial order which, as the Supreme Court explained in *Century Services*, is to provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize.

21 For the purposes of an initial order, the debtor corporation must convince the court that the initial order will "usefully further" its efforts towards attempted reorganization. If the debtor corporation satisfies this onus, the court may grant the initial application and provide the conditions under which the debtor corporation can attempt to reorganize, namely, staying creditor enforcement to preserve the debtor corporation's status quo for a limited period of time. If, however, the debtor corporation fails to satisfy this onus and the court determines that the application is merely an effort by the debtor corporation to avoid its obligations to its creditors and postpone an inevitable liquidation, the initial application should be denied: *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* at 53-54.

B. Good faith and due diligence

22 In addition to proving appropriate circumstances, the applicant corporation must convince the court that it is acting in good faith and with due diligence pursuant to s. 11.02(3)(b). Despite the wording of s. 11.02(3)(b) indicating "good faith and due diligence" applies only to orders under subsection (2), that being orders "other than initial applications", the Supreme Court in *Century Services* determined good faith and due diligence applies to initial orders as well:

[69] The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

[70] The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. ...

23 Although it is a consideration for granting an initial order, courts generally defer the in-depth analysis of good faith and due diligence to subsequent applications, such as the extension of the initial 30-day order: Rogers, Sieradski & Kanter, "What Does 'Good Faith' Mean in Insolvency Proceedings?" Vol 4-4 Insolvency Institute of Canada (Articles) (WL). If, however, the court determines the debtor corporation is not seeking *CCAA* protection in good faith or there is convincing evidence of a lack of due diligence, the court may deny an initial order on the basis of a failure to satisfy the baseline requirement in s. 11.02(3)(b): see *Alberta Treasury*.

C. Did the Chambers judge err in granting the initial order?

24 The appellants submit the Chambers judge erred in concluding the respondents had satisfied the "appropriate circumstances" and "good faith and due diligence" requirements contained in ss. 11.02(3)(a) and (b).

25 In support of this argument, the appellants contend *CCAA* proceedings are not appropriate as the respondents have only one active business, the Copper Sands Trailer Park, which has only two employees. The appellants argue *CCAA* proceedings are not needed to "avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating assets" as there are no such consequences given the minimal business activity of the respondents.

26 In addition, the appellants submit the Chambers judge failed to consider the creditors' lack of faith and confidence in management when determining whether the initial order was appropriate. The appellants also allege the Chambers judge failed to provide adequate reasons for his conclusion that the respondents were acting in good faith and with due diligence.

27 The Chambers judge determined the respondents were engaged in active business, which was "facing a looming liquidity condition or crisis" if an initial order and a stay of proceedings were not granted (*November fiat* at para 15). The Chambers judge concluded the "initial stay of proceedings [would] give the applicants the time to restructure and refinance their operations" (*December fiat* at para 14).

28 The Chambers judge was satisfied the respondents were not seeking *CCAA* protection merely to postpone inevitable liquidation:

[10] In this case I find that the applicants, or at least MDI Utility Corp. and CSLC, are engaged in an active business rather than being simply real estate developers as alleged by the respondents. CSLC operates a mobile home park. MDI Utility Corp. is completing a water treatment utility to provide wastewater treatment services to both the existing mobile home park and an upcoming Tanglewood development on CSLC lands. This is not a situation where the applicants seek *CCAA* protection for the purpose of obtaining more time to sell or refinance property as was the situation in *Marine Drive Properties Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 BCSC 145; *Redekop Properties Inc. (Re)*, 2001 BCSC 1892; and *Octagon Properties Group Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 ABQB 500, 486 AR 296. (*December fiat*)

29 As for whether there was a reasonable possibility of restructuring, the Chambers judge noted he was "satisfied that the completion of the water treatment utility [would] add to the overall net worth" of the respondents (*December fiat* at para 13). The Chambers judge also noted that the respondents had, at the time of the initial application, secured an interim financier willing to fund the completion of the water treatment utility and the *CCAA* proceedings.

30 On this basis, the Chambers judge concluded as follows:

[14] I am satisfied that the applicants have satisfied the onus upon them to establish that they are acting in good faith and with due diligence and that an order for an initial stay of proceedings is appropriate. ...

(*December fiat*)

31 As discussed, the purpose of the initial order is to stay creditor enforcement to grant the debtor corporation a limited period of time to attempt to devise a viable restructuring plan. To obtain an initial order, the debtor corporation must satisfy the court that the initial order will "usefully further" its efforts towards attempted reorganization. The debtor corporation is not required, at this stage of the proceedings, to provide a full-fledged restructuring plan, but is required to show, at the very least, it has a "germ of a plan": see *Alberta Treasury*. The court must be convinced the debtor corporation is not seeking *CCAA* proceedings simply to delay the inevitable liquidation in order to "buy time".

32 It is clear the Chambers judge was cognizant of these purposes and the baseline considerations, which the respondents had to satisfy prior to receiving the initial order. The Chambers judge concluded the initial order would usefully further the remedial purposes of the *CCAA* by providing the conditions upon which the respondents could attempt to reorganize their affairs. He was satisfied on the evidence before him, that there was at least a "germ of a plan", given the fact the respondents had secured interim financing to facilitate the commissioning of the water treatment facility.

33 It is also clear the Chambers judge considered the creditors' lack of confidence. In his fiat, the Chambers judge stated: "[u]fortunately, and unlike many *CCAA* applications, all of the respondent secured creditors oppose the application" (*November fiat* at para 21). Despite this, the Chambers judge determined the initial order was appropriate in the circumstances based on the factors discussed above. The Chambers judge was entitled to reach this conclusion. Whether the creditors have lost confidence in the debtor corporation's management is something the court must consider when assessing whether to grant an initial order. However, the creditors' lack of faith is not determinative and does not necessarily dictate denying an initial application: *Forest & Marine Financial Corp., Re*, 2009 BCCA 319 B.C. C.A. at para 27, 200996 B.C.L.R. (4th) 77 (B.C. C.A.); *Pacific Shores Resort & Spa Ltd., Re*, 2011 BCSC 1775 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) at paras 40-44 and 49(c).

34 Upon review, although his reasons are not extensive, it is clear the Chambers judge properly considered whether the baseline considerations contained in ss. 11.02(3)(a) and (b) were satisfied. Given the real time nature of *CCAA* proceedings, Chambers judges are not required to give extensive reasons addressing each and every argument raised by the parties when granting initial applications (*Alberta Treasury Branches v. Conserve Oil Ist Corp.*, 2016 ABCA 87 (Alta. C.A.) at paras 14-15, 201635 C.B.R. (6th) 6 (Alta. C.A.)). We also note that the Chambers judge was not required to undertake an in-depth analysis to determine good faith and due diligence at this stage of the proceedings as a more in-depth analysis will be taken if the respondents make an application to extend the order or if they seek additional court orders.

35 Given the deference afforded to a chambers judge making *CCAA* decisions, this Court will only intervene if the lack of reasons leads to a reasonable belief that the Chambers judge ignored or misconceived the evidence *in a way that affected his conclusion* (*York (Regional Municipality) v. Thornhill Green Co-Operative Homes Inc.*, 2010 ONCA 393, 262 O.A.C. 232 (Ont. C.A.)). This threshold for intervention is not met in this case. Therefore, the appellants' appeal regarding the initial order is dismissed.

V. INTERIM FINANCING

36 In addition to granting the initial order, the Chambers judge authorized the respondents to obtain interim financing up to \$1.25 million. The interim financing was given a priority charge upon the respondents' assets and over the claims of the appellants. The appellants appealed this order on the grounds the Chambers judge failed to consider the relevant factors pursuant to [s. 11.2\(4\) of the CCAA](#) prior to granting the order with respect to interim financing.

37 Pursuant to [s. 11.2\(1\) of the CCAA](#), a debtor corporation may apply to the court at any stage of the proceedings for interim financing. As Dr. Janis Sarra explains, "interim financing" refers primarily to the working capital that the debtor corporation requires in order to continue operating during restructuring proceedings, as well as to finance the costs of the [CCAA](#) process (*Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* at 197). The underlying premise of interim financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders "as it allows the debtor to protect going-concern value while it attempts to devise a plan of compromise or arrangement acceptable to creditors" (at 197). Interim financing is generally granted to ensure the debtor corporation can continue its essential operations, such as "keeping the lights on" and paying employees, while it undergoes the [CCAA](#) proceedings.

38 Before an order allowing interim financing to be obtained can be granted, the court must consider, among other things, the factors enumerated in [s. 11.2\(4\)](#). If granted, the court may order the interim financing have a priority charge over the corporation's assets pursuant to [s. 11.2\(2\)](#):

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in [paragraph 23\(1\)\(b\)](#), if any.

39 If the applicant corporation applies for interim financing at the same time as it applies for an initial order, the court must be diligent in its consideration of the factors enumerated in [s. 11.2\(4\)](#). The court must assess whether it is imperative and appropriate to order interim financing at the very outset of [CCAA](#) proceedings. Given that the purpose of seeking and granting an initial order is to provide the conditions upon which the debtor corporation can plan a compromise or reorganization to present to its creditors, the court must be cautious when asked to authorize large sums of interim financing at the initial stage,

unless there is evidence that the financing is needed to enable the debtor corporation to undergo this planning process. This is especially important when the applicant is seeking a priority charge on the interim financing.

A. Did the Chambers judge err in allowing interim financing to be obtained?

40 The appellants submit the Chambers judge erred in granting the respondents \$1.25 million interim financing due to his failure to consider one or more of the factors identified in s. 11.2(4).

41 The Chambers judge provided the following reasons for authorizing the interim financing at the same time he granted the initial application:

[13] I also approve the interim financing order sought by the applicants. The interim financing lender, Staheli Construction Ltd., has agreed to advance the sum of \$1,250,000 to the applicants subject to obtaining a first charge on the assets of the company. The \$1,250,000 will be allocated \$800,000 to complete the commissioning of the water treatment utility owned by MDI Utility, \$337,500 for the cost of the CCAA proceedings and \$112,500 for the ongoing costs of the applicants according to the proposed monitor's initial report. The respondents say that they will be prejudiced by any priority charge given to the interim lender and suggest that the completion of the water treatment utility adds little to no value to the overall net worth of the applicants. However, I am satisfied that the completion of the water treatment utility will add to the overall net worth of the applicants and the monitor will ensure that the \$800,000 is being appropriately used for the purpose intended.

(December fiat)

42 This analysis fails to consider multiple factors in s. 11.2(4), namely the period of time the parties were expected to be subject to CCAA proceedings pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(a) and "whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement" pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d).

43 The appellants strongly opposed the use of any funds to complete the commissioning of the water treatment facility. In their view, it is a failed operation that will cost more than the allotted \$800,000 to complete. Even if completed, the appellants are of the opinion the water treatment facility has no reasonable commercial value and therefore, its completion cannot result in a viable restructuring or compromise between it and the respondents. The appellants argued that granting interim financing to complete the water treatment facility would only result in the respondents incurring further debt; debt that will inevitably fall on the creditors' shoulders when the respondents are forced to liquidate, given that there is no chance of a successful restructuring. The appellants stressed that the interim financing would significantly prejudice their position as it has received a priority charge over the respondents' assets.

44 Although the Chambers judge concluded the completion of the water treatment facility would "add to the overall net worth" of the respondents, he failed to consider whether this added net worth would enhance the prospect of a viable compromise pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d). Given the creditors steadfast opposition to the interim financing, it was incumbent on the Chambers judge to consider this factor. It is clear the Chambers judge failed to do so. He also failed to consider the length of time the parties would be subject to CCAA proceedings pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(a).

45 There was no evidence of urgent circumstances dictating a need to permit the respondents to obtain interim financing with a priority charge at this stage of the proceedings. Given that the respondents' only active business is the Copper Sands Trailer Park, which receives a monthly income that is sufficient to keep the lights on and to pay the only two employees, the interim financing was not needed to preserve the status quo or maintain the respondents' essential operations. Moreover, there was no evidence the interim financing was needed to enable the respondents' *planning* of the compromise or arrangement it would eventually present to the creditors. To the contrary, there was evidence that granting interim financing to complete the water treatment plan would *deter* the parties from reaching a viable compromise at this stage of the proceedings.

46 Given the preliminary stage the CCAA proceedings were at, there was no detailed plan evidencing how the commissioning of the water treatment facility would contribute to a viable restructuring of the respondents. As discussed above, a detailed plan

is not a prerequisite to obtain an initial order. However, something more concrete and justifiable is needed in order to grant interim financing for something that is beyond what is needed to preserve the debtor corporation's status quo.

47 We note that this is not a situation where there was unanimous creditor support for the interim financing to fund the commissioning of the water treatment facility. The creditors strongly opposed the funds being sought to facilitate the construction of a project they viewed as an inevitable failure. This fact further detracts from the appropriateness of granting the interim financing, with a priority charge, at this preliminary stage of the proceedings.

48 The Chambers judge erred by failing to properly consider how these facts impacted the likelihood of a viable compromise or arrangement being made with respect to the respondents pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d).

VI. CONCLUSION

49 In conclusion, we find no error with the Chambers judge's determination that "appropriate circumstances" existed and that the respondents were acting in good faith and with due diligence so as to merit granting the initial 30-day order. The Chambers judge did, however, err in permitting the respondents to obtain \$1.25 million interim financing when he granted the initial order.

50 Therefore, the appeal is allowed in relation to the interim financing and the part of the initial order relating to interim financing is set aside. The remaining components of the initial order remain intact and the other grounds of appeal are dismissed. We note that our decision does not prevent the respondents from initiating another application for interim financing at a later date if they so choose.

51 Since there was divided success, there will be no order as to costs with respect to the appeal or the leave application.

Ryan-Froslic J.A.:

I concur.

Schwann J.A.:

I concur.

Appeal allowed in part.

Footnotes

* A corrigendum issued by the court on May 31, 2018 has been incorporated herein.

TAB I

2013 ABQB 432

Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Alberta Treasury Branches v. Tallgrass Energy Corp

2013 CarswellAlta 1496, 2013 ABQB 432, [2013] A.W.L.D. 4492,

[2013] A.W.L.D. 4494, 231 A.C.W.S. (3d) 961, 8 C.B.R. (6th) 161

Alberta Treasury Branches Plaintiff and Tallgrass Energy Corp. Defendant

In The Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of the Alberta Business Corporation Act, R.S.A.
2000, c. B-9, as amended and Tallgrass Energy Corp. Defendant

B.E. Romaine J.

Heard: July 24, 2013

Judgment: August 6, 2013

Docket: Calgary 1301-08759, 1301-08497

Counsel: Thomas Cumming, Jeffrey Oliver for Plaintiff, Alberta Treasury Branches
Howard Gorman for Toscana Capital Corporation
Ryan Zahara, Matthew Beavers for Defendant, Tallgrass Energy Corp.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

IV Receivers

IV.1 Appointment

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

XIX.2 Initial application

XIX.2.c Dismissal of application

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Dismissal of application
Defendant TG applied for initial order under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(Can.\) \(CCAA\)](#) — Plaintiff ATB extended \$12 million credit facility to TG, payable on demand and secured by first charge on all company's assets — TC granted TG bridge loan credit facility in amount of \$6 million secured by second in priority charge against assets — TG defaulted — ATB and TC issued demands to TG — TG sought initial order under [CCAA](#) — Prior to TG's application, secured creditors ATB and TC applied for order appointing receiver over property and assets of company — TG currently had assets of \$28,829,874 and liabilities of \$28,896,371 — Secured lenders were owed about \$18 million and it had unsecured accounts payable of \$3 million — Property, plant and equipment were valued at approximately \$21.6 million — Defendant's application dismissed; plaintiff's application granted — TG met technical requirements for protection under [CCAA](#) — TG breached provisions of ATB credit facility and TC bridge loan facility — Secured lenders were entitled to apply for receivership order — TG failed to establish that there was any reasonable possibility that it would be able to restructure its affairs — Restructuring options proposed by TG were not realistic or commercially reasonable — It would likely be liquidating [CCAA](#) — Secured lenders objected to TG management controlling liquidation process under [CCAA](#) protection as they had lost faith in management — Secured lenders had not acted precipitously — TG had adequate opportunity to canvas market for refinancing and restructuring options —

TG and secured creditors were in adversarial mode, which did not make for efficient and inexpensive CCAA restructuring — CCAA order was not appropriate It followed that application for receivership must succeed.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Receivers — Appointment

Defendant TG applied for initial order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Can.) (CCAA)* — Plaintiff ATB extended \$12 million credit facility to TG, payable on demand and secured by first charge on all company's assets — TC granted TG bridge loan credit facility in amount of \$6 million secured by second in priority charge against assets — TG defaulted — ATB and TC issued demands to TG — TG sought initial order under CCAA — Prior to TG's application, secured creditors ATB and TC applied for order appointing receiver over property and assets of company — TG currently had assets of \$28,829,874 and liabilities of \$28,896,371 — Secured lenders were owed about \$18 million and it had unsecured accounts payable of \$3 million — Property, plant and equipment were valued at approximately \$21.6 million — Defendant's application dismissed; plaintiff's application granted — TG met technical requirements for protection under CCAA — TG breached provisions of ATB credit facility and TC bridge loan facility — Secured lenders were entitled to apply for receivership order — TG failed to establish that there was any reasonable possibility that it would be able to restructure its affairs — Restructuring options proposed by TG were not realistic or commercially reasonable — It would likely be liquidating CCAA — Secured lenders objected to TG management controlling liquidation process under CCAA protection as they had lost faith in management — Secured lenders had not acted precipitously — TG had adequate opportunity to canvas market for refinancing and restructuring options — TG and secured creditors were in adversarial mode, which did not make for efficient and inexpensive CCAA restructuring — CCAA order was not appropriate It followed that application for receivership must succeed.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *B.E. Romaine J.*:

Inducon Development Corp., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306, 1991 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

APPLICATION by company for initial order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*(Can.); APPLICATION by creditors for order appointing receiver over property and assets of company.

B.E. Romaine J.:

Introduction

1 Tallgrass Energy Corp applied for an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended. That application was opposed by its secured creditors, Alberta Treasury Branches and Toscana Capital Corporation, which prior to Tallgrass' application for CCAA protection had applied for an order appointing a receiver over the property and assets of the company. I dismissed Tallgrass' application for an initial CCAA order and allowed the receivership application. These are my reasons.

Facts

2 In July, 2012, ATB extended a \$12 million credit facility to Tallgrass, payable on demand and secured by a first charge on all of the company's assets. At about the same time, Toscana granted Tallgrass a bridge loan credit facility in the amount of \$6 million secured by a second in priority charge against the assets. This bridge loan facility matured on April 30, 2013.

3 In July, 2012, John McAdam, the CEO of Tallgrass, began the process of looking for traditional financing to replace the Toscana bridge financing. In early 2013, Mr. McAdam realized that no conventional financing was available, and Tallgrass began to explore the availability of non-traditional forms of financing.

4 Tallgrass management decided to attempt to obtain \$100 million of non-traditional financing, as there were no third parties willing to step into the shoes of Toscana's subordinate position. The company retained an advisor in March, 2013 to aid in the search.

5 After the Toscana facility matured on April 30, 2013, Tallgrass acknowledged that the loan was in default. Toscana agreed to forbear enforcement until May 31, 2013 to provide Tallgrass with additional time to finalize certain financing alternatives that were being explored.

6 On June 17, 2013, Toscana issued a demand to Tallgrass, and on June 25, 2013, ATB followed with its demand. There is no issue that Tallgrass is also in default of the ATB credit facility.

7 On June 27, 2013, at the request of the secured lenders, Tallgrass retained Grant Thornton Limited as financial advisor, on the condition that Grant Thornton would provide financial information and reports to the secured lenders. Grant Thornton provided two reports to the lenders, on July 4 and on July 11, 2013. The lenders granted further forbearance during this period and continuing until July 17, 2013.

8 On about July 15, 2013, on the basis of the information and reports received from Grant Thornton, Toscana advised Tallgrass that it would not be prepared to grant further forbearance, and that it intended to bring an application to appoint a receiver on Wednesday, July 24, 2013. On July 16, 2013, ATB advised Tallgrass that it was taking the same position, and that after July 17, 2013, Tallgrass would have no further access to the remaining \$100,000 available under the line of credit.

9 Tallgrass sought an initial order under the CCAA on July 17, 2013. The application was put over to July 24, 2013 to be heard at the same time as the receivership application, with a temporary stay to preserve the status quo. ATB agreed to allow Tallgrass access to up to \$50,000 of the line of credit to pay certain critical suppliers.

10 In its application, Tallgrass represented that it currently has assets of \$28,829,874 and liabilities of \$28,896,371. The secured lenders are owed approximately \$18 million and Tallgrass has unsecured accounts payable in the amount of roughly \$3 million, decommissioning liabilities as of March 31, 2013 in the amount of approximately \$7.4 million and a financing contract under which approximately \$484,000 is outstanding as of March 31, 2013.

11 The company values its property, plant and equipment, including undeveloped land, at approximately \$21.6 million.

Analysis

12 As a preliminary matter, it is clear that Tallgrass meets the technical requirements for protection under the CCAA. It is also clear and uncontested that Tallgrass has breached various provisions of the ATB credit facility and the Toscana bridge loan facility, and that the secured lenders are entitled to apply for a receivership order. In fact, there was no question that, if Tallgrass's application for an initial order under the CCAA did not succeed, a receivership would follow.

13 As I indicated in *Matco Capital Ltd. v Interex Oilfield Services Ltd.*, (1 August 2006), Docket No. 060108395, a section 11 order under the CCAA is not granted merely upon the fact of its application. Tallgrass must satisfy the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate, and that it has acted and is acting in good faith and with due diligence. The CCAA therefore requires that the court hearing the application exercise discretion in making these determinations.

14 A key issue here is whether Tallgrass can establish that there is any reasonable possibility that it will be able to restructure its affairs. The burden placed on an applicant for an initial CCAA order in this regard is not a very onerous one, in that it is not necessary for an applicant company to have a fully-developed plan or the support of its secured creditors, although either or both are desirable and helpful. However, there must be some evidence of what Farley J. in *Inducon Development Corp., Re*, 1991 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) referred to as the outline of a plan, what he called the "germ of a plan": para 14. I would add a further gloss on that phrase: there should be a germ of a reasonable and realistic plan, particularly if there is opposition from the major stakeholders most at risk in the proposed restructuring. As noted in *Inducon Development Corp., Re* at para

13, the CCAA is remedial, not preventative, and it should not be the "last gasp of a dying company". Unfortunately, Tallgrass appears to be at that desperate stage.

15 While it is certainly true that the fundamental purpose of the CCAA is to permit a company to carry on business and where possible avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets, this is a company with very few employees, a handful of independent contractors, and relatively minor unsecured debt. Tallgrass does not carry on a business that has broader community or social implications that may require greater flexibility from creditors. The major stakeholders here are the secured lenders who oppose the application, and the equity holders.

16 The secured lenders submit that the restructuring options presented by Tallgrass are commercially unrealistic and unlikely to come to fruition, that it is obvious that a liquidation of the assets will be the end result for this company, and that they have lost confidence in the management of Tallgrass to effect such a liquidation. They submit that, as they are likely the only parties with any economic interest in the company, their preference for a receivership over what would ultimately be a liquidating CCAA should be taken into account.

17 I must agree that the restructuring options proposed by Tallgrass, while more detailed than the kind of general good intentions offered by the applicant in *Matco*, are not realistic or commercially reasonable. Specifically:

1. Tallgrass concedes that it has exhausted any chance of conventional financing after nearly a year of attempting to find a conventional lender to take out its existing secured debt, turning in early 2013 to what it calls non-traditional sources;

2. Company management decided in March of this year to pursue \$100 million in non-traditional debt rather than merely retiring existing secured debt of \$18 million. As noted by the secured lenders, it is unrealistic for a small public company with a market capitalization of approximately \$800,000 and existing assets worth roughly \$29 million, which has already encountered difficulties finding sources of funding to take out Toscana's subordinate position, to attempt to obtain \$100 million in financing within a reasonable time frame. The unsatisfactory and uncertain results of approximately six months of effort in that regard must be analyzed carefully;

3. Tallgrass has obtained no firm commitments for refinancing. What it has been able to obtain is the following:

a) a letter dated July 23, 2013 from a financing broker that purports to be a "commitment letter". This "commitment" to lend \$100 million states that the broker will source the finding through an unnamed "top 25 bank". It requires an upfront "bank guarantee fee" of \$2 million. The letter provides that the broker shall have no liability to Tallgrass "under any theory of law or equity" for the failure of any transaction contemplated by the loan commitment letter. The secured lenders have pointed out the many unusual provisions of this letter, and ask, reasonably enough, why a "top 25 bank" would contemplate a loan of \$100 million to Tallgrass in its present circumstances. Tallgrass management has had no direct discussion with any financial institution and is relying on assurances from the broker that the source of funding would be reputable.

This "commitment letter" lacks credibility. At any rate, Tallgrass is unable in its current financial state even to fund the \$2 million bank guarantee fee necessary to take the proposal to a next step. This leads to the next proposal.

b) Tallgrass has obtained a letter from a friend of its CEO that indicates that he has obtained verbal commitments from Chinese investors in the amount of \$10 million for the purpose of investing in the company, and that they are willing to fund the \$2 million required by the above-noted proposal. The secured lenders note that this potential funding source has no track record or experience with respect to Canadian oil and gas assets, and that, even if the commitment became firm, the amount is insufficient to pay off existing indebtedness.

c) Tallgrass has identified a further option, a potential loan in the process of negotiations with a broker, not a source lender, that would involve the broker earning approximately \$16 million in fees to find a source for a \$100 million loan. This is an even softer proposal, with no real commitment. Tallgrass' CEO concedes in understatement that this would be "expensive funding".

18 Given that these options are not commercially realistic, I must conclude that the secured lenders are correct in their view that this would likely be a liquidating CCAA. While this does not in itself preclude the use of the statute, the secured lenders object to Tallgrass management controlling the liquidation process under CCAA protection as they have lost faith in such management. The secured lenders have identified concerns about management's estimate of the value of Tallgrass' oil and gas assets, concerns about the effect of abandonment liabilities on realization values, and concerns about discrepancies between the Cost Flow Projections contained in the CCAA application as compared to those prepared by Grant Thornton. The secured lenders also have concerns with respect to how management is executing its alternate financing strategy, particularly its decision to pursue financing from the kind of sources it has identified, and what they feel is a lack of attention from senior management to realistic alternatives and options. They are critical of management's decisions with respect to covering short-term liabilities in the course of these applications.

19 Tallgrass submits that the opinions given by an officer of Toscana, Dean Jensen, on behalf of the secured lenders with respect to the value of its oil and gas assets should be given little weight as Mr. Jensen does not have the proper expertise to comment on the reserve reports. I take Mr. Jensen's comments to be the opinions of a banker experienced with loans in the oil and gas sector and with familiarity with reserve reports. What Mr. Jensen is really questioning is whether Tallgrass would be able to achieve a price for these assets equal to management's projections, and whether such projections are reliable. He thus questions whether the secured lenders are assured of recovery or whether they are at risk.

20 The concern expressed by Mr. Jensen with respect to cost flow projections relates to whether the costs of a CCAA proceeding will be as projected by Tallgrass, and, again, a lack of confidence with respect to management's projections in that regard. While it appears that Mr. Jensen may have misunderstood some of the calculations, there remain unanswered questions about the projections.

21 This is not a case where the secured lenders have acted precipitously, or where the debtor has not had a more than adequate opportunity to canvass the market for refinancing and restructuring options. This process has been ongoing for more than a year under Tallgrass management, which was not able to obtain take-out financing for Toscana's bridge loan, nor obtain sufficient financing to satisfy its licensee liability rating report requirements and provide funding necessary for further development activities. It is also clear that Tallgrass and its major secured stakeholders are in an adversarial mode, which does not bode well for an efficient or relatively inexpensive CCAA restructuring. Tallgrass was most likely a liquidating CCAA, and given the lack of confidence and the adversarial relationship between the company and the secured lenders at risk, I was not satisfied that a CCAA order would be appropriate in the circumstances. I dismissed Tallgrass' application.

22 It thus followed that the secured lenders' application for a receivership order must succeed.

Company's application dismissed; creditors' application granted.

TAB J

2002 SKQB 161

Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench

Oblats de Marie Immaculee du Manitoba, Re

2002 CarswellSask 287, 2002 SKQB 161, 113 A.C.W.S. (3d) 566, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 76

**In the Matter of an Application by Les Oblats de Marie Immaculee du Manitoba,
Pursuant to the Companies' Creditor Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

Zarzeczny J.

Judgment: April 18, 2002

Docket: Regina Q.B.G. 865/02

Counsel: *James S. Ehmman*, for Applicant, Les Oblats de Marie Immaculee du Manitoba

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

XIX.1 General principles

XIX.1.e Jurisdiction

XIX.1.e.i Court

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues
Religious order was constituted by Manitoba statute and was given power to act as manager of temporal affairs of Roman Catholic Church in province — Religious order was also extra-provincially registered in Saskatchewan — Religious order was defendant to hundreds of lawsuits brought against it in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Northern Ontario respecting activities of certain of its members acting in various capacities at residential schools run by order in those provinces — Majority of claims to date had been brought in Saskatchewan and chief business of order over last two years was management and defence of these claims — Religious order brought application in Saskatchewan pursuant to s. 11 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for order granting stay of proceedings against it and authorizing it to file formal plan of compromise or arrangement — Application dismissed — Saskatchewan court was without jurisdiction to issue orders applied for — Section 9(1) of Act required that application be made to court in Manitoba — Head office of order was in Winnipeg, Manitoba — Most if not all of order's assets were located in Winnipeg or administered out of order's offices in Winnipeg — Most if not all of existing members of order, including retired members living in order's retirement home, resided in Manitoba — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 9, 9(1), 11.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Zarzeczny J.:

Prince Edward Island Development Agency v. Perfection Foods Ltd., 29 C.B.R. (3d) 137, 124 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 142, 384 A.P.R. 142, 1994 CarswellPEI 9 (P.E.I. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Perfection Foods Ltd., 90 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 302, 280 A.P.R. 302, 1991 CarswellPEI 116 (P.E.I. T.D.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 9 — considered

s. 9(1) — considered

s. 11(1) — pursuant to

s. 11.7(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

Les Oblats de Marie Immaculée du Manitoba Incorporation Act, R.S.M. 1990, c. 131

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) — considered

s. 2(4) — considered

s. 2(6) — considered

APPLICATION by religious order pursuant to s. 11 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* for order granting stay of proceedings against it and authorizing it to file formal plan of compromise or arrangement.

Zarzeczny J.:

1 The Applicant, Les Oblats De Marie Immaculee Du Manitoba ("LOMI"), apply *ex parte* pursuant to s. 11(1) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as am. (the "CCAA") for an order granting a stay of any and all proceedings against or in respect of the Applicant and authorizing the Applicant to file with this Court a formal plan of compromise or arrangement. A draft order has been filed indicating that the relief and orders applied for are intended to subsist for an interim period of thirty days only, after which it is intended that a notice of motion for further orders will be presented for the Court's consideration. The motion is intended to be served upon identified interested parties and their solicitors.

2 The material in support of the application consists only of two affidavits, one filed by Father James Fiori of Winnipeg, Manitoba, the Provincial Superior of LOMI and the affidavit of Clark Sullivan, a chartered accountant of Edmonton, Alberta, representing the firm of Sullivan & Associates Inc. proposed as Monitor of the property and assets of LOMI pursuant to s. 11.7(1) of the *CCAA*.

3 The affidavit of Father Fiori deposes that LOMI was initially constituted a body corporate by an Act of the Manitoba legislature in 1873. Most recently, the Manitoba legislature enacted *Les Oblats de Marie Immaculée du Manitoba Incorporation Act*, R.S.M. 1990, c. 131, to replace the 1873 legislation. The "business" of LOMI is set out in s. 2 which recognizes the objects and powers of LOMI in part as follows:

2(1) The corporation shall have power to act as manager of the temporal affairs of the Roman Catholic Church in any parish in the Province of Manitoba; the establishing and carrying on of missions; the erection, maintenance and conduct of schools, colleges, churches, orphanages and hospitals; the promotion of the spiritual education and other interests of the Roman Catholic Church; the conducting, taking charge of, holding and managing property, both real, personal and mixed, which may at any time or in any manner come to or vest in or which may heretofore have vested in the said corporation for any purpose whatever, by purchase, gift, grant, devise or otherwise, to take, buy, hold, purchase and receive by gift, grant, devise or otherwise any property, either real, personal or mixed, and to mortgage, pledge, sell or dispose of the same or any part thereof.

4 Section 2(4) of that Act provides as follows:

2(4) **The head office of the corporation shall be at the City of Winnipeg, or such other place in the Province of Manitoba** as may from time to time be determined by the by-laws of the corporation.

[Emphasis added]

5 Subsection 2(6) provides that persons of Roman Catholic faith who are members of the religious order known as La Congrégation des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie Immaculée and by decision of the supreme authority of the Order, are associated to Les Révérends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba, constitute the members of LOMI.

6 Father Fiori's affidavit deposes that LOMI has been extra-provincially registered in Saskatchewan although no further information or particulars are provided with respect to this registration nor with respect to any registered, functional or operating office in Saskatchewan. The affidavit does not depose to any activity presently being carried out by LOMI or any of its members in Saskatchewan, nor is there any indication that any members of LOMI are actively involved in this province.

7 LOMI is either a defendant or third party to hundreds, perhaps soon to be thousands, of law suits which have been initiated in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Northern Ontario respecting the activity of certain members of LOMI acting in various capacities at residential schools in these provinces. By far, the largest number of claims initiated (presently 1,742) are in Saskatchewan, although there are 479 plaintiffs in Manitoba and 167 in Northern Ontario. Paragraph 13 of Father Fiori's affidavit deposes in part:

... I do verily believe that there may be a significant number of further IRS lawsuits commenced in Manitoba.

These circumstances prompt Father Fiori to depose in paragraph 8 of his affidavit:

Over the course of the last two years, the chief business of LOMI has been the management and defence of IRS [Indian Residential School] claims in Saskatchewan.

8 The members of LOMI are missionary Catholic priests and brothers. The current membership, for which LOMI has financial responsibility, stands at 58 men, 39 of whom are more than 70 years of age and most of whom reside at a retirement home owned and operated by LOMI in Winnipeg, Manitoba. (Father Fiori affidavit, para. 5).

9 An examination of the financial statements and analysis tendered as exhibits "E" and "F" to Father Fiori's affidavit establish that the principal assets of LOMI consist of financial investments as well as capital assets. The latter includes real property with a realizable estimated value slightly in excess of \$2,000,000.00. Although Father Fiori's affidavit does not further particularize the nature and location of either the investment or capital assets, it is fair to assume, in respect of the latter, that they would include the retirement home known as Casa Bonita owned and operated by LOMI (see para. 5 of the affidavit), and located in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Additionally, although Father Fiori's affidavit does not specify it, it is a clear inference to be drawn that the head office of LOMI (as its incorporating legislation mandates) is in Manitoba as appear to be LOMI's administrative offices.

10 This analysis of the materials and information supplied upon and in support of this *ex parte* application is set out with a view to the provisions and application of s. 9 of the *CCAA* dealing, as it does, with the subject headed "Jurisdiction of court to receive applications".

11 Section 9(1) of the *CCAA* provides:

9.(1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction **in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.** [Emphasis added]

12 The material makes it abundantly clear that the head office of LOMI is in Winnipeg, Manitoba as mandated by its incorporating legislation. Nothing in the affidavit materials filed suggests otherwise. It is also clear that most of the assets (if not all of the assets) tangible and intangible of LOMI are located in Winnipeg or administered out of the offices of LOMI in Winnipeg, Manitoba. It is equally clear that the existing members of LOMI, including retired members who have a very real interest in and will be very much affected by this application (and for whose benefit it may well be taken) all, or for the most part, reside in Manitoba. The materials filed depose to no assets being located in Saskatchewan, no members presently being or operating in Saskatchewan, nor to any of LOMI's members being actively engaged in the pursuit of its "business" as broadly

defined by s. 2(1) of the *Les Oblats De Marie Immaculée Du Manitoba Incorporation Act* in this province. If it is otherwise, the materials do not reveal it.

13 The proper interpretation and application of s. 9 of the *CCAA* was considered in the case of *Royal Bank v. Perfection Foods Ltd.* (1991), 90 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 302 (P.E.I. T.D.). At p. 311 MacDonald C.J.T.D. observes in part as follows at para. 44:

[44] In my opinion, the "head office" of the companies means its registered head office. The situation here is identical to the facts in *Re Smith Transportation Co. Ltd.*, [1928] 2 D.L.R. 508, 10 C.B.R. 48, 62 O.L.R. 203. As to a company's "chief place of business", I was not cited any cases where this term has been explored. Determining a chief place of business is a question of fact and those facts concerning the companies and the businesses they conduct must be considered. The number of employees, the goods being sold, the length of time each aspect of the business has been carried on and the location where that has been done, the income and expenses of the company and its allocation between different aspects of the company are, I am sure, a few of the considerations to be dealt with.

At paras. 45 and 46 he observes and concludes as follows:

[45] The respondents have stated that because the *C.C.A.A.* is a federal statute weight must be given to making orders applicable on a wider basis than that of a single province. I do not give weight to that submission for the reason that s. 9 of the *Act* makes it clear that provincial jurisdiction is of prime importance.

[46] It is for the respondents to establish that the sought after order under the *C.C.A.A.* is within jurisdiction. I do not believe that they have laid before me sufficient facts to establish that the affected companies come within the jurisdiction of this province....

14 The judgment of Macdonald C.J.T.D. was appealed (1994), 29 C.B.R. (3d) 137 (P.E.I. C.A.). for circumstances and upon grounds unrelated to the present issue before the Court.

15 Accordingly, in view of the plain and ordinary meaning and interpretation of s. 9 of the *CCAA*, I have concluded that this Court in Saskatchewan is without jurisdiction to issue the orders applied for. Based upon the materials presently before this Court, it appears clear that this application, or any other made under the *CCAA*, must appropriately be made to the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba. The application must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Application dismissed.

TAB K

Most Negative Treatment: Recently added (treatment not yet designated)

Most Recent Recently added (treatment not yet designated): [In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) | 2023 ONSC 753, 2023 CarswellOnt 1528 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Jan 30, 2023)

2010 ONSC 222

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc., Re

2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC 222, [2010] O.J. No. 188, 184 A.C.W.S. (3d) 684, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST PUBLISHING INC./PUBLICATIONS
CANWEST INC., CANWEST BOOKS INC. AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.**

Pepall J.

Judgment: January 18, 2010

Docket: CV-10-8533-00CL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb, Duncan Ault for Applicant, LP Entities

Mario Forte for Special Committee of the Board of Directors

Andrew Kent, Hilary Clarke for Administrative Agent of the Senior Secured Lenders' Syndicate

Peter Griffin for Management Directors

Robin B. Schwill, Natalie Renner for Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders

David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.a Approval by creditors](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.5 Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous

CMI, entity of C Corp., obtained protection from creditors in [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("CCAA"\)](#) proceedings in October 2009 — CPI, newspaper entities related to C, sought similar protection — CPI brought application for order pursuant to [CCAA](#) and for stay of proceedings and other benefits of order to be extended to CPI — Application granted — CPI was clearly insolvent — Community served by CPI was huge — Granting of order premised on anticipated going concern sale of newspaper business, which would serve interests of CPI and stakeholders and also community at large — Order requested would provide stability and enable CPI to pursue restructuring and preserve enterprise value for stakeholders — Without benefit of stay, CPI would have been required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would have been unable to continue operating business.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by creditors

CMI, entity of C Corp., obtained protection from creditors in [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("CCAA"\)](#) proceedings in October 2009 — CPI, newspaper entities related to C, sought similar protection — CPI brought application for order pursuant to

CCAA and for stay of proceedings and other benefits of order to be extended to CPI — Application granted — CPI was clearly insolvent — Community served by CPI was huge — Granting of order premised on anticipated going concern sale of newspaper business, which would serve interests of CPI and stakeholders and also community at large — Order requested would provide stability and enable CPI to pursue restructuring and preserve enterprise value for stakeholders — Without benefit of stay, CPI would have been required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would have been unable to continue operating business — In circumstances, it was appropriate to allow CPI to file and present plan only to secured creditors.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

- Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 2254, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) — considered
- Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (2003), 310 N.R. 200 (note), 2003 CarswellOnt 730, 2003 CarswellOnt 731, 180 O.A.C. 399 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to
- Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 6184, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed
- Grant Forest Products Inc., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
- Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re* (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 54, 2006 CarswellOnt 264 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed
- Philip Services Corp., Re* (1999), 13 C.B.R. (4th) 159, 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)* (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 4 — considered

s. 5 — considered

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 137(2) — considered

APPLICATION by entity of company already protected under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for similar protection.

Pepall J.:

Reasons for Decision

Introduction

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global") is a leading Canadian media company with interests in (i) newspaper publishing and digital media; and (ii) free-to-air television stations and subscription based specialty television channels. Canwest Global, the entities in its Canadian television business (excluding CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries) and the National Post Company (which prior to October 30, 2009 owned and published the National Post) (collectively, the "CMI Entities"), obtained protection from their creditors in a *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*¹ ("CCAA") proceeding on October 6, 2009.² Now, the Canwest Global Canadian newspaper entities with the exception of National Post Inc. seek similar protection. Specifically, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc. ("CPI"), Canwest Books Inc. ("CBI"), and Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI") apply for an order pursuant to the CCAA. They also seek to have the stay of proceedings and the other benefits of the order extend to Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Société en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"). The Applicants and the Limited Partnership are referred to as the "LP Entities" throughout these reasons. The term "Canwest" will be used to refer to the Canwest enterprise as a whole. It includes the LP Entities and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries which are not applicants in this proceeding.

2 All appearing on this application supported the relief requested with the exception of the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders. That Committee represents certain unsecured creditors whom I will discuss more fully later.

3 I granted the order requested with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

4 I start with three observations. Firstly, Canwest Global, through its ownership interests in the LP Entities, is the largest publisher of daily English language newspapers in Canada. The LP Entities own and operate 12 daily newspapers across Canada. These newspapers are part of the Canadian heritage and landscape. The oldest, The Gazette, was established in Montreal in 1778. The others are the Vancouver Sun, The Province, the Ottawa Citizen, the Edmonton Journal, the Calgary Herald, The Windsor Star, the Times Colonist, The Star Phoenix, the Leader-Post, the Nanaimo Daily News and the Alberni Valley Times. These newspapers have an estimated average weekly readership that exceeds 4 million. The LP Entities also publish 23 non-daily newspapers and own and operate a number of digital media and online operations. The community served by the LP Entities is huge. In addition, based on August 31, 2009 figures, the LP Entities employ approximately 5,300 employees in Canada with approximately 1,300 of those employees working in Ontario. The granting of the order requested is premised on an anticipated going concern sale of the newspaper business of the LP Entities. This serves not just the interests of the LP Entities and their stakeholders but the Canadian community at large.

5 Secondly, the order requested may contain some shortcomings; it may not be perfect. That said, insolvency proceedings typically involve what is feasible, not what is flawless.

6 Lastly, although the builders of this insolvent business are no doubt unhappy with its fate, gratitude is not misplaced by acknowledging their role in its construction.

Background Facts

(i) Financial Difficulties

7 The LP Entities generate the majority of their revenues through the sale of advertising. In the fiscal year ended August 31, 2009, approximately 72% of the LP Entities' consolidated revenue derived from advertising. The LP Entities have been

seriously affected by the economic downturn in Canada and their consolidated advertising revenues declined substantially in the latter half of 2008 and in 2009. In addition, they experienced increases in certain of their operating costs.

8 On May 29, 2009 the Limited Partnership failed, for the first time, to make certain interest and principal reduction payments and related interest and cross currency swap payments totaling approximately \$10 million in respect of its senior secured credit facilities. On the same day, the Limited Partnership announced that, as of May 31, 2009, it would be in breach of certain financial covenants set out in the credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007 between its predecessor, Canwest Media Works Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent, a syndicate of secured lenders ("the LP Secured Lenders"), and the predecessors of CCI, CPI and CBI as guarantors. The Limited Partnership also failed to make principal, interest and fee payments due pursuant to this credit agreement on June 21, June 22, July 21, July 22 and August 21, 2009.

9 The May 29, 2009, defaults under the senior secured credit facilities triggered defaults in respect of related foreign currency and interest rate swaps. The swap counterparties (the "Hedging Secured Creditors") demanded payment of \$68.9 million. These unpaid amounts rank *pari passu* with amounts owing under the LP Secured Lenders' credit facilities.

10 On or around August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership and certain of the LP Secured Lenders entered into a forbearance agreement in order to allow the LP Entities and the LP Secured Lenders the opportunity to negotiate a pre-packaged restructuring or reorganization of the affairs of the LP Entities. On November 9, 2009, the forbearance agreement expired and since then, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to demand payment of approximately \$953.4 million, the amount outstanding as at August 31, 2009. Nonetheless, they continued negotiations with the LP Entities. The culmination of this process is that the LP Entities are now seeking a stay of proceedings under the CCAA in order to provide them with the necessary "breathing space" to restructure and reorganize their businesses and to preserve their enterprise value for the ultimate benefit of their broader stakeholder community.

11 The Limited Partnership released its annual consolidated financial statements for the twelve months ended August 31, 2009 and 2008 on November 26, 2009. As at August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated assets with a net book value of approximately \$644.9 million. This included consolidated current assets of \$182.7 million and consolidated non-current assets of approximately \$462.2 million. As at that date, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated liabilities of approximately \$1.719 billion (increased from \$1.656 billion as at August 31, 2008). These liabilities consisted of consolidated current liabilities of \$1.612 billion and consolidated non-current liabilities of \$107 million.

12 The Limited Partnership had been experiencing deteriorating financial results over the past year. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership's consolidated revenues decreased by \$181.7 million or 15% to \$1.021 billion as compared to \$1.203 billion for the year ended August 31, 2008. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership reported a consolidated net loss of \$66 million compared to consolidated net earnings of \$143.5 million for fiscal 2008.

(ii) Indebtedness under the Credit Facilities

13 The indebtedness under the credit facilities of the LP Entities consists of the following.

(a) The LP senior secured credit facilities are the subject matter of the July 10, 2007 credit agreement already mentioned. They are guaranteed by CCI, CPI and CBI. The security held by the LP Secured Lenders has been reviewed by the solicitors for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. and considered to be valid and enforceable.³ As at August 31, 2009, the amounts owing by the LP Entities totaled \$953.4 million exclusive of interest.⁴

(b) The Limited Partnership is a party to the aforementioned foreign currency and interest rate swaps with the Hedging Secured Creditors. Defaults under the LP senior secured credit facilities have triggered defaults in respect of these swap arrangements. Demand for repayment of amounts totaling \$68.9 million (exclusive of unpaid interest) has been made. These obligations are secured.

(c) Pursuant to a senior subordinated credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007, between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent for a syndicate of lenders, and others, certain subordinated lenders agreed to provide the Limited Partnership with access to a term credit facility of up to \$75 million. CCI, CPI, and CBI are guarantors. This facility is unsecured, guaranteed on an unsecured basis and currently fully drawn. On June 20, 2009, the Limited Partnership failed to make an interest payment resulting in an event of default under the credit agreement. In addition, the defaults under the senior secured credit facilities resulted in a default under this facility. The senior subordinated lenders are in a position to take steps to demand payment.

(d) Pursuant to a note indenture between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of New York Trust Company of Canada as trustee, and others, the Limited Partnership issued 9.5% per annum senior subordinated unsecured notes due 2015 in the aggregate principal amount of US \$400 million. CPI and CBI are guarantors. The notes are unsecured and guaranteed on an unsecured basis. The noteholders are in a position to take steps to demand immediate payment of all amounts outstanding under the notes as a result of events of default.

14 The LP Entities use a centralized cash management system at the Bank of Nova Scotia which they propose to continue. Obligations owed pursuant to the existing cash management arrangements are secured (the "Cash Management Creditor").

(iii) LP Entities' Response to Financial Difficulties

15 The LP Entities took a number of steps to address their circumstances with a view to improving cash flow and strengthening their balance sheet. Nonetheless, they began to experience significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and other trade creditors. The LP Entities' debt totals approximately \$1.45 billion and they do not have the liquidity required to make payment in respect of this indebtedness. They are clearly insolvent.

16 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of directors (the "Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives. The Special Committee has appointed Thomas Strike, the President, Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation, as Recapitalization Officer and has retained Gary Colter of CRS Inc. as Restructuring Advisor for the LP Entities (the "CRA"). The President of CPI, Dennis Skulsky, will report directly to the Special Committee.

17 Given their problems, throughout the summer and fall of 2009, the LP Entities have participated in difficult and complex negotiations with their lenders and other stakeholders to obtain forbearance and to work towards a consensual restructuring or recapitalization.

18 An ad hoc committee of the holders of the senior subordinated unsecured notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee") was formed in July, 2009 and retained Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg as counsel. Among other things, the Limited Partnership agreed to pay the Committee's legal fees up to a maximum of \$250,000. Representatives of the Limited Partnership and their advisors have had ongoing discussions with representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee and their counsel was granted access to certain confidential information following execution of a confidentiality agreement. The Ad Hoc Committee has also engaged a financial advisor who has been granted access to the LP Entities' virtual data room which contains confidential information regarding the business and affairs of the LP Entities. There is no evidence of any satisfactory proposal having been made by the noteholders. They have been in a position to demand payment since August, 2009, but they have not done so.

19 In the meantime and in order to permit the businesses of the LP Entities to continue to operate as going concerns and in an effort to preserve the greatest number of jobs and maximize value for the stakeholders of the LP Entities, the LP Entities have been engaged in negotiations with the LP Senior Lenders, the result of which is this CCAA application.

(iv) The Support Agreement, the Secured Creditors' Plan and the Solicitation Process

20 Since August 31, 2009, the LP Entities and the LP administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders have worked together to negotiate terms for a consensual, prearranged restructuring, recapitalization or reorganization of the business and affairs of the LP Entities as a going concern. This is referred to by the parties as the Support Transaction.

21 As part of this Support Transaction, the LP Entities are seeking approval of a Support Agreement entered into by them and the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders. 48% of the LP Secured Lenders, the Hedging Secured Creditors, and the Cash Management Creditor (the "Secured Creditors") are party to the Support Agreement.

22 Three interrelated elements are contemplated by the Support Agreement and the Support Transaction: the credit acquisition, the Secured Creditors' plan (the "Plan"), and the sale and investor solicitation process which the parties refer to as SISF.

23 The Support Agreement contains various milestones with which the LP Entities are to comply and, subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process (an important caveat in my view), commits them to support a credit acquisition. The credit acquisition involves an acquisition by an entity capitalized by the Secured Creditors and described as AcquireCo. AcquireCo. would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities (including the shares in National Post Inc.) and assume certain of the liabilities of the LP Entities. It is contemplated that AcquireCo. would offer employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and would assume all of the LP Entities' existing pension plans and existing post-retirement and post-employment benefit plans subject to a right by AcquireCo., acting commercially reasonably and after consultation with the operational management of the LP Entities, to exclude certain specified liabilities. The credit acquisition would be the subject matter of a Plan to be voted on by the Secured Creditors on or before January 31, 2010. There would only be one class. The Plan would only compromise the LP Entities' secured claims and would not affect or compromise any other claims against any of the LP Entities ("unaffected claims"). No holders of the unaffected claims would be entitled to vote on or receive any distributions of their claims. The Secured Creditors would exchange their outstanding secured claims against the LP Entities under the LP credit agreement and the swap obligations respectively for their *pro rata* shares of the debt and equity to be issued by AcquireCo. All of the LP Entities' obligations under the LP secured claims calculated as of the date of closing less \$25 million would be deemed to be satisfied following the closing of the Acquisition Agreement. LP secured claims in the amount of \$25 million would continue to be held by AcquireCo. and constitute an outstanding unsecured claim against the LP Entities.

24 The Support Agreement contemplates that the Financial Advisor, namely RBC Dominion Securities Inc., under the supervision of the Monitor, will conduct the solicitation process. Completion of the credit acquisition process is subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process. In general terms, the objective of the solicitation process is to obtain a better offer (with some limitations described below) than that reflected in the credit acquisition. If none is obtained in that process, the LP Entities intend for the credit acquisition to proceed assuming approval of the Plan. Court sanction would also be required.

25 In more detailed terms, Phase I of the solicitation process is expected to last approximately 7 weeks and qualified interested parties may submit non-binding proposals to the Financial Advisor on or before February 26, 2010. Thereafter, the Monitor will assess the proposals to determine whether there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining a Superior Offer. This is in essence a cash offer that is equal to or higher than that represented by the credit acquisition. If there is such a prospect, the Monitor will recommend that the process continue into Phase II. If there is no such prospect, the Monitor will then determine whether there is a Superior Alternative Offer, that is, an offer that is not a Superior Offer but which might nonetheless receive approval from the Secured Creditors. If so, to proceed into Phase II, the Superior Alternative Offer must be supported by Secured Creditors holding more than at least 33.3% of the secured claims. If it is not so supported, the process would be terminated and the LP Entities would then apply for court sanction of the Plan.

26 Phase II is expected to last approximately 7 weeks as well. This period allows for due diligence and the submission of final binding proposals. The Monitor will then conduct an assessment akin to the Phase I process with somewhat similar attendant outcomes if there are no Superior Offers and no acceptable Alternative Superior Offers. If there were a Superior Offer or an acceptable Alternative Superior Offer, an agreement would be negotiated and the requisite approvals sought.

27 The solicitation process is designed to allow the LP Entities to test the market. One concern is that a Superior Offer that benefits the secured lenders might operate to preclude a Superior Alternative Offer that could provide a better result for the unsecured creditors. That said, the LP Entities are of the view that the solicitation process and the support transaction present the best opportunity for the businesses of the LP Entities to continue as going concerns, thereby preserving jobs as well as the economic and social benefits of their continued operation. At this stage, the alternative is a bankruptcy or liquidation which

would result in significant detriment not only to the creditors and employees of the LP Entities but to the broader community that benefits from the continued operation of the LP Entities' business. I also take some comfort from the position of the Monitor which is best captured in an excerpt from its preliminary Report:

The terms of the Support Agreement and SISP were the subject of lengthy and intense arm's length negotiations between the LP Entities and the LP Administrative Agent. The Proposed Monitor supports approval of the process contemplated therein and of the approval of those documents, but without in any way fettering the various powers and discretions of the Monitor.

28 It goes without saying that the Monitor, being a court appointed officer, may apply to the court for advice and directions and also owes reporting obligations to the court.

29 As to the objection of the Ad Hoc Committee, I make the following observations. Firstly, they represent unsecured subordinated debt. They have been in a position to take action since August, 2009. Furthermore, the LP Entities have provided up to \$250,000 for them to retain legal counsel. Meanwhile, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to enforce their rights through a non-consensual court proceeding and have advised the LP Entities of their abilities in that regard in the event that the LP Entities did not move forward as contemplated by the Support Agreement. With the Support Agreement and the solicitation process, there is an enhanced likelihood of the continuation of going concern operations, the preservation of jobs and the maximization of value for stakeholders of the LP Entities. It seemed to me that in the face of these facts and given that the Support Agreement expired on January 8, 2010, adjourning the proceeding was not merited in the circumstances. The Committee did receive very short notice. Without being taken as encouraging or discouraging the use of the comeback clause in the order, I disagree with the submission of counsel to the Ad Hoc Committee to the effect that it is very difficult if not impossible to stop a process relying on that provision. That provision in the order is a meaningful one as is clear from the decision in *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re*⁵. On a come back motion, although the positions of parties who have relied bona fide on an Initial Order should not be prejudiced, the onus is on the applicants for an Initial Order to satisfy the court that the existing terms should be upheld.

Proposed Monitor

30 The Applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor. It currently serves as the Monitor in the CMI Entities' CCAA proceeding. It is desirable for FTI to act; it is qualified to act; and it has consented to act. It has not served in any of the incompatible capacities described in section 11.7(2) of the CCAA. The proposed Monitor has an enhanced role that is reflected in the order and which is acceptable.

Proposed Order

31 As mentioned, I granted the order requested. It is clear that the LP Entities need protection under the CCAA. The order requested will provide stability and enable the LP Entities to pursue their restructuring and preserve enterprise value for their stakeholders. Without the benefit of a stay, the LP Entities would be required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would be unable to continue operating their businesses.

(a) Threshold Issues

32 The chief place of business of the Applicants is Ontario. They qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. They are affiliated companies with total claims against them that far exceed \$5 million. Demand for payment of the swap indebtedness has been made and the Applicants are in default under all of the other facilities outlined in these reasons. They do not have sufficient liquidity to satisfy their obligations. They are clearly insolvent.

(b) Limited Partnership

33 The Applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and the other relief requested to the Limited Partnership. The CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or a limited partnership but courts have exercised their inherent

jurisdiction to extend the protections of an Initial CCAA Order to partnerships when it was just and convenient to do so. The relief has been held to be appropriate where the operations of the partnership are so intertwined with those of the debtor companies that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted: *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*⁶ and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*⁷.

34 In this case, the Limited Partnership is the administrative backbone of the LP Entities and is integral to and intertwined with the Applicants' ongoing operations. It owns all shared information technology assets; it provides hosting services for all Canwest properties; it holds all software licences used by the LP Entities; it is party to many of the shared services agreements involving other Canwest entities; and employs approximately 390 full-time equivalent employees who work in Canwest's shared services area. The Applicants state that failure to extend the stay to the Limited Partnership would have a profoundly negative impact on the value of the Applicants, the Limited Partnership and the Canwest Global enterprise as a whole. In addition, exposing the assets of the Limited Partnership to the demands of creditors would make it impossible for the LP Entities to successfully restructure. I am persuaded that under these circumstances it is just and convenient to grant the request.

(c) *Filing of the Secured Creditors' Plan*

35 The LP Entities propose to present the Plan only to the Secured Creditors. Claims of unsecured creditors will not be addressed.

36 The CCAA seems to contemplate a single creditor-class plan. Sections 4 and 5 state:

s.4 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

s.5 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

37 Case law has interpreted these provisions as authorizing a single creditor-class plan. For instance, Blair J. (as he then was) stated in *Philip Services Corp., Re*⁸: "There is no doubt that a debtor is at liberty, under the terms of sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA, to make a proposal to secured creditors or to unsecured creditors or to both groups."⁹ Similarly, in *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re*¹⁰, the Court of Appeal stated: "It may also be noted that s. 5 of the CCAA contemplates a plan which is a compromise between a debtor company and its secured creditors and that by the terms of s. 6 of the Act, applied to the facts of this case, the plan is binding only on the secured creditors and the company and not on the unsecured creditors."¹¹

38 Based on the foregoing, it is clear that a debtor has the statutory authority to present a plan to a single class of creditors. In *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re*, the issue was raised in the context of the plan's sanction by the court and a consideration of whether the plan was fair and reasonable as it eliminated the opportunity for unsecured creditors to realize anything. The basis of the argument was that the motions judge had erred in not requiring a more complete and in depth valuation of the company's assets relative to the claims of the secured creditors.

39 In this case, I am not being asked to sanction the Plan at this stage. Furthermore, the Monitor will supervise a vigorous and lengthy solicitation process to thoroughly canvass the market for alternative transactions. The solicitation should provide a good indication of market value. In addition, as counsel for the LP Entities observed, the noteholders and the LP Entities never had any forbearance agreement. The noteholders have been in a position to take action since last summer but chose not to do so. One would expect some action on their part if they themselves believed that they "were in the money". While the process is not perfect, it is subject to the supervision of the court and the Monitor is obliged to report on its results to the court.

40 In my view it is appropriate in the circumstances to authorize the LP Entities to file and present a Plan only to the Secured Creditors.

(D) DIP Financing

41 The Applicants seek approval of a DIP facility in the amount of \$25 million which would be secured by a charge over all of the assets of the LP Entities and rank ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge, and ahead of all other existing security interests except validly perfected purchase money security interests and certain specific statutory encumbrances.

42 Section 11.2 of the CCAA provides the statutory jurisdiction to grant a DIP charge. In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹², I addressed this provision. Firstly, an applicant should address the requirements contained in section 11.2 (1) and then address the enumerated factors found in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA. As that list is not exhaustive, it may be appropriate to consider other factors as well.

43 Applying these principles to this case and dealing firstly with section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, notice either has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the security or charge or alternatively they are not affected by the DIP charge. While funds are not anticipated to be immediately necessary, the cash flow statements project a good likelihood that the LP Entities will require the additional liquidity afforded by the \$25 million. The ability to borrow funds that are secured by a charge will help retain the confidence of the LP Entities' trade creditors, employees and suppliers. It is expected that the DIP facility will permit the LP Entities to conduct the solicitation process and consummate a recapitalization transaction of a sale of all or some of its assets. The charge does not secure any amounts that were owing prior to the filing. As such, there has been compliance with the provisions of section 11.2 (1).

44 Turning then to a consideration of the factors found in section 11.2(4) of the Act, the LP Entities are expected to be subject to these CCAA proceedings until July 31, 2010. Their business and financial affairs will be amply managed during the proceedings. This is a consensual filing which is reflective of the confidence of the major creditors in the current management configuration. All of these factors favour the granting of the charge. The DIP loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement and would ensure the necessary stability during the CCAA process. I have already touched upon the issue of value. That said, in relative terms, the quantum of the DIP financing is not large and there is no readily apparent material prejudice to any creditor arising from the granting of the charge and approval of the financing. I also note that it is endorsed by the proposed Monitor in its report.

45 Other factors to consider in assessing whether to approve a DIP charge include the reasonableness of the financing terms and more particularly the associated fees. Ideally there should be some evidence on this issue. Prior to entering into the forbearance agreement, the LP Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a DIP facility. In this case, some but not all of the Secured Creditors are participating in the financing of the DIP loan. Therefore, only some would benefit from the DIP while others could bear the burden of it. While they may have opted not to participate in the DIP financing for various reasons, the concurrence of the non participating Secured Creditors is some market indicator of the appropriateness of the terms of the DIP financing.

46 Lastly, I note that the DIP lenders have indicated that they would not provide a DIP facility if the charge was not approved. In all of these circumstances, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and grant the DIP charge.

(e) Critical Suppliers

47 The LP Entities ask that they be authorized but not required to pay pre-filing amounts owing in arrears to certain suppliers if the supplier is critical to the business and ongoing operations of the LP Entities or the potential future benefit of the payments is considerable and of value to the LP Entities as a whole. Such payments could only be made with the consent of the proposed Monitor. At present, it is contemplated that such suppliers would consist of certain newspaper suppliers, newspaper distributors, logistic suppliers and the Amex Bank of Canada. The LP Entities do not seek a charge to secure payments to any of its critical suppliers.

48 Section 11.4 of the CCAA addresses critical suppliers. It states:

11.4(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods and services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares the person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied upon the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

49 Mr. Byers, who is counsel for the Monitor, submits that the court has always had discretion to authorize the payment of critical suppliers and that section 11.4 is not intended to address that issue. Rather, it is intended to respond to a post-filing situation where a debtor company wishes to compel a supplier to supply. In those circumstances, the court may declare a person to be a critical supplier and require the person to supply. If the court chooses to compel a person to supply, it must authorize a charge as security for the supplier. Mr. Barnes, who is counsel for the LP Entities, submits that section 11.4 is not so limited. Section 11.4 (1) gives the court general jurisdiction to declare a supplier to be a "critical supplier" where the supplier provides goods or services that are essential to the ongoing business of the debtor company. The permissive as opposed to mandatory language of section 11.4 (2) supports this interpretation.

50 Section 11.4 is not very clear. As a matter of principle, one would expect the purpose of section 11.4 to be twofold: (i) to codify the authority to permit suppliers who are critical to the continued operation of the company to be paid and (ii) to require the granting of a charge in circumstances where the court is compelling a person to supply. If no charge is proposed to be granted, there is no need to give notice to the secured creditors. I am not certain that the distinction between Mr. Byers and Mr. Barnes' interpretation is of any real significance for the purposes of this case. Either section 11.4(1) does not oust the court's inherent jurisdiction to make provision for the payment of critical suppliers where no charge is requested or it provides authority to the court to declare persons to be critical suppliers. Section 11.4(1) requires the person to be a supplier of goods and services that are critical to the companies' operation but does not impose any additional conditions or limitations.

51 The LP Entities do not seek a charge but ask that they be authorized but not required to make payments for the pre-filing provision of goods and services to certain third parties who are critical and integral to their businesses. This includes newsprint and ink suppliers. The LP Entities are dependent upon a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint and ink and they have insufficient inventory on hand to meet their needs. It also includes newspaper distributors who are required to distribute the newspapers of the LP Entities; American Express whose corporate card programme and accounts are used by LP Entities employees for business related expenses; and royalty fees accrued and owing to content providers for the subscription-based online service provided by FPinformart.ca, one of the businesses of the LP Entities. The LP Entities believe that it would be damaging to both their ongoing operations and their ability to restructure if they are unable to pay their critical suppliers. I am satisfied that the LP Entities may treat these parties and those described in Mr. Strike's affidavit as critical suppliers but none will be paid without the consent of the Monitor.

(f) Administration Charge and Financial Advisor Charge

52 The Applicants also seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure the fees of the Monitor, its counsel, the LP Entities' counsel, the Special Committee's financial advisor and counsel to the Special Committee, the CRA and counsel to the CRA. These are professionals whose services are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities' business. This charge is to

rank in priority to all other security interests in the LP Entities' assets, with the exception of purchase money security interests and specific statutory encumbrances as provided for in the proposed order.¹³ The LP Entities also request a \$10 million charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, RBC Dominion Securities Inc. The Financial Advisor is providing investment banking services to the LP Entities and is essential to the solicitation process. This charge would rank in third place, subsequent to the administration charge and the DIP charge.

53 In the past, an administration charge was granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court. Section 11.52 of the amended CCAA now provides statutory jurisdiction to grant an administration charge. Section 11.52 states:

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the debtor company is subject to a security or charge - in an amount that the court considers appropriate - in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

54 I am satisfied that the issue of notice has been appropriately addressed by the LP Entities. As to whether the amounts are appropriate and whether the charges should extend to the proposed beneficiaries, the section does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in its assessment. It seems to me that factors that might be considered would include:

- (a) the size and complexity of the businesses being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the Monitor.

This is not an exhaustive list and no doubt other relevant factors will be developed in the jurisprudence.

55 There is no question that the restructuring of the LP Entities is large and highly complex and it is reasonable to expect extensive involvement by professional advisors. Each of the professionals whose fees are to be secured has played a critical role in the LP Entities restructuring activities to date and each will continue to be integral to the solicitation and restructuring process. Furthermore, there is no unwarranted duplication of roles. As to quantum of both proposed charges, I accept the Applicants' submissions that the business of the LP Entities and the tasks associated with their restructuring are of a magnitude and complexity that justify the amounts. I also take some comfort from the fact that the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders has agreed to them. In addition, the Monitor supports the charges requested. The quantum of the administration charge appears to be fair and reasonable. As to the quantum of the charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, it is more unusual as it involves an incentive payment but I note that the Monitor conducted its own due diligence and, as mentioned, is supportive of the request. The quantum reflects an appropriate incentive to secure a desirable alternative offer. Based on all of these factors, I concluded that the two charges should be approved.

(g) Directors and Officers

56 The Applicants also seek a directors and officers charge ("D & O charge") in the amount of \$35 million as security for their indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed upon the Applicants' directors and officers. The D & O charge will rank after the Financial Advisor charge and will rank *pari passu* with the MIP charge discussed subsequently. Section 11.51 of the CCAA addresses a D & O charge. I have already discussed section 11.51 in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁴ as it related to the request by the CMI Entities for a D & O charge. Firstly, the charge is essential to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. The continued participation of the experienced Boards of Directors, management and employees of the LP Entities is critical to the restructuring. Retaining the current officers and directors will also avoid destabilization. Furthermore, a CCAA restructuring creates new risks and potential liabilities for the directors and officers. The amount of the charge appears to be appropriate in light of the obligations and liabilities that may be incurred by the directors and officers. The charge will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in a worse case scenario. While Canwest Global maintains D & O liability insurance, it has only been extended to February 28, 2009 and further extensions are unavailable. As of the date of the Initial Order, Canwest Global had been unable to obtain additional or replacement insurance coverage.

57 Understandably in my view, the directors have indicated that due to the potential for significant personal liability, they cannot continue their service and involvement in the restructuring absent a D & O charge. The charge also provides assurances to the employees of the LP Entities that obligations for accrued wages and termination and severance pay will be satisfied. All secured creditors have either been given notice or are unaffected by the D & O charge. Lastly, the Monitor supports the charge and I was satisfied that the charge should be granted as requested.

(h) Management Incentive Plan and Special Arrangements

58 The LP Entities have made amendments to employment agreements with 2 key employees and have developed certain Management Incentive Plans for 24 participants (collectively the "MIPs"). They seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure these obligations. It would be subsequent to the D & O charge.

59 The CCAA is silent on charges in support of Key Employee Retention Plans ("KERPs") but they have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings. Most recently, in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁵, I approved the KERP requested on the basis of the factors enumerated in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re*¹⁶ and given that the Monitor had carefully reviewed the charge and was supportive of the request as were the Board of Directors, the Special Committee of the Board of Directors, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Adhoc Committee of Noteholders.

60 The MIPs in this case are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the LP Entities through a successful restructuring. The participants are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. They are experienced executives and have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives to date. They are integral to the continued operation of the business during the restructuring and the successful completion of a plan of restructuring, reorganization, compromise or arrangement.

61 In addition, it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities in the absence of a charge securing their payments. The departure of senior management would distract from and undermine the restructuring process that is underway and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for these employees. The MIPs provide appropriate incentives for the participants to remain in their current positions and ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in the reorganization process.

62 In this case, the MIPs and the MIP charge have been approved in form and substance by the Board of Directors and the Special Committee of Canwest Global. The proposed Monitor has also expressed its support for the MIPs and the MIP charge in its pre-filing report. In my view, the charge should be granted as requested.

(i) Confidential Information

63 The LP Entities request that the court seal the confidential supplement which contains individually identifiable information and compensation information including sensitive salary information about the individuals who are covered by the MIPs. It also contains an unredacted copy of the Financial Advisor's agreement. I have discretion pursuant to [Section 137\(2\) of the Courts of Justice Act](#)¹⁷ to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record. That said, public access is an important tenet of our system of justice.

64 The threshold test for sealing orders is found in the Supreme Court of Canada decision of *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹⁸. In that case, Iacobucci J. stated that an order should only be granted when: (i) it is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (ii) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

65 In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁹ I applied the *Sierra Club* test and approved a similar request by the Applicants for the sealing of a confidential supplement containing unredacted copies of KERPs for the employees of the CMI Entities. Here, with respect to the first branch of the *Sierra Club* test, the confidential supplement contains unredacted copies of the MIPs. Protecting the disclosure of sensitive personal and compensation information of this nature, the disclosure of which would cause harm to both the LP Entities and the MIP participants, is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The information would be of obvious strategic advantage to competitors. Moreover, there are legitimate personal privacy concerns in issue. The MIP participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and their salary information will be kept confidential. With respect to the second branch of the *Sierra Club* test, keeping the information confidential will not have any deleterious effects. As in the *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* case, the aggregate amount of the MIP charge has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. The salutary effects of sealing the confidential supplement outweigh any conceivable deleterious effects. In the normal course, outside of the context of a CCAA proceeding, confidential personal and salary information would be kept confidential by an employer and would not find its way into the public domain. With respect to the unredacted Financial Advisor agreement, it contains commercially sensitive information the disclosure of which could be harmful to the solicitation process and the salutary effects of sealing it outweigh any deleterious effects. The confidential supplements should be sealed and not form part of the public record at least at this stage of the proceedings.

Conclusion

66 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to grant the order requested.

Application granted.

Footnotes

- 1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended.
- 2 On October 30, 2009, substantially all of the assets and business of the National Post Company were transferred to the company now known as National Post Inc.
- 3 Subject to certain assumptions and qualifications.
- 4 Although not formally in evidence before the court, counsel for the LP Secured Lenders advised the court that currently \$382,889,000 in principal in Canadian dollars is outstanding along with \$458,042,000 in principal in American dollars.
- 5 [2006 CarswellOnt 264](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 6 [2009 CarswellOnt 6184](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 29.
- 7 (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

8 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

9 Ibid at para. 16.

10 (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (March 6,2003) [2003 CarswellOnt 730 (S.C.C.)].

11 Ibid at para. 34.

12 Supra, note 7 at paras. 31-35.

13 This exception also applies to the other charges granted.

14 Supra note 7 at paras. 44-48.

15 Supra note 7.

16 [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

17 R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, as amended.

18 [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.).

19 Supra, note 7 at para. 52.

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

TAB L

2012 ONSC 506

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Timminco Ltd., Re

2012 CarswellOnt 1263, 2012 ONSC 506, [2012] O.J. No. 472, 217 A.C.W.S. (3d) 12, 85 C.B.R. (5th) 169, 95 C.C.P.B. 48

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36, as Amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Timminco Limited and Bécancour Silicon Inc. (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: January 12, 2012

Judgment: February 2, 2012

Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

Counsel: A.J. Taylor, M. Konyukhova, K. Esaw, for Applicants
D.W. Ellickson, for Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union of Canada
C. Sinclair, for United Steelworkers' Union
K. Peters, for AMG Advance Metallurgical Group NV
M. Bailey, for Superintendent of Financial Services (Ontario)
S. Weisz, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
A. Kauffman, for Investissement Quebec

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Labour; Employment; Public

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

I Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction

I.1 Constitutional jurisdiction of Federal government and provinces

I.1.c Paramountcy of Federal legislation

Bankruptcy and insolvency

X Priorities of claims

X.2 Preferred claims

X.2.c Costs and expenses of administrators

X.2.c.ii Priority over other claims

Bankruptcy and insolvency

X Priorities of claims

X.2 Preferred claims

X.2.d Wages and salaries of employees

X.2.d.i Entitlement to preferred status

Bankruptcy and insolvency

X Priorities of claims

X.6 Restricted and postponed claims

X.6.b Officers, directors, and stockholders

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

XIX.1 General principles

XIX.1.c Application of Act

XIX.1.c.iv Miscellaneous

Business associations

V Legal proceedings involving business associations

V.3 Practice and procedure in proceedings involving corporations

V.3.n Confidentiality or sealing orders

Labour and employment law

I Labour law

I.6 Collective agreement

I.6.1 Employee benefits

I.6.1.iii Pensions

Pensions

I Private pension plans

I.1 Administration of pension plans

I.1.g Valuation and funding of plans

I.1.g.ii Funding arrangements

Pensions

I Private pension plans

I.2 Payment of pension

I.2.1 Bankruptcy or insolvency of employer

I.2.1.ii Registered plans

Pensions

I Private pension plans

I.2 Payment of pension

I.2.m Special payments

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Preferred claims — Costs and expenses of administrators — Priority over other claims

Super priority of administration charge — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — Absence of court-ordered super priority charge would frustrate objectives of [CCAA](#) — Without assistance of advisors, and in void caused by lack of governance structure, companies would be unable to proceed with restructuring and likely result would be bankruptcy — It was unlikely that advisors would participate in proceedings, and it was neither reasonable nor realistic to expect advisors to participate, unless administration charge was granted to secure their fees and disbursements — Role of advisors was critical to efforts to restructure insolvent companies — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since alternative was bankruptcy, which would not be better result for stakeholders.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Restricted and postponed claims — Officers, directors, and stockholders Super priority of directors' and officers' charge — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — Absence of court-ordered super priority charge would frustrate objectives of [CCAA](#) — Without assistance of advisors, and in void caused by lack of governance structure, companies would be unable to proceed with restructuring and likely result would be bankruptcy — Directors and officers would be unlikely to continue their service without D&O charge —

It was neither reasonable nor realistic to expect directors and officers to continue without requested protection — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since alternative was bankruptcy, which would not be better result for stakeholders.

Pensions --- Payment of pension — Bankruptcy or insolvency of employer — Registered plans

Suspension of special payments — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Companies had insufficient liquidity to make special payments to plans at this time — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since likely outcome should proceedings fail was bankruptcy — There was no priority for special payments in bankruptcy — Application of provincial pensions legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Requiring companies to make special payments would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, which was what [CCAA](#) was intended to avoid.

Pensions --- Administration of pension plans — Valuation and funding of plans — Funding arrangements

Suspension of special payments — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Companies had insufficient liquidity to make special payments to plans at this time — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since likely outcome should proceedings fail was bankruptcy — There was no priority for special payments in bankruptcy — Application of provincial pensions legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Requiring companies to make special payments would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, which was what [CCAA](#) was intended to avoid.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — General principles — Application of Act — Miscellaneous

Relationship between Act and provincial pensions acts — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Application of provincial pension legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Order requiring company to make special payments in accordance with provincial legislation would frustrate rehabilitative purpose of [CCAA](#) if such order would have effect of forcing company into bankruptcy — It was necessary to invoke doctrine of paramountcy such that provisions of [CCAA](#) overrode those of provincial pension legislation.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Constitutional jurisdiction of Federal government and provinces — Paramountcy of Federal legislation

Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was

necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Application of provincial pension legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy, contrary to purpose of CCAA — It was necessary to invoke doctrine of paramountcy such that provisions of CCAA overrode those of provincial pension legislation — Doctrine of paramountcy was properly invoked.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Preferred claims — Wages and salaries of employees — Entitlement to preferred status

Key Employee Retention Plans — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Insolvent companies' board of directors approved key employee retention plans (KERPs) in order to keep employees who were considered critical to successful proceedings under CCAA because they were experienced employees who played central roles in restructuring initiatives — Insolvent companies brought motion for order approving KERPs, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report — Motion granted — KERPs were approved — It was necessary that KERPs' participants be incentivized to remain in current positions during restructuring process — Continued participation of these employees would assist company in its objectives — Replacement of these employees if they left would not provide any substantial economic benefits to company — Confidential supplement to monitor's report, which contained copies of unredacted KERPs, was sealed pursuant to R. 151 of Federal Courts Rules.

Business associations --- Legal proceedings involving business associations — Practice and procedure in proceedings involving corporations — Confidentiality or sealing orders

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Supplement to monitor's report — Insolvent companies obtained relief under CCAA — Insolvent companies' board of directors approved key employee retention plans (KERPs) in order to keep certain employees who were considered critical to successful proceedings under CCAA — Supplement to monitor's report contained copies of unredacted KERPs, which had sensitive personal compensation information — Insolvent companies brought motion for order approving KERPs, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report — Motion granted — KERPs were approved — Confidential supplement to monitor's report was sealed pursuant to R. 151 of Federal Courts Rules for period of 45 days — Disclosure of personal information in supplement could compromise commercial interests of companies and cause harm to KERPs' participants — Confidentiality order was necessary to prevent serious risk to companies' and KERPs participants' interests.

Labour and employment law --- Labour law — Collective agreement — Employee benefits — Pensions

Insolvent employer.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

AbitibiBowater inc., Re (2009), 74 C.C.P.B. 254, D.T.E. 2009T-434, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 285, 2009 QCCS 2028, 2009 CarswellQue 4329, [2009] R.J.Q. 1415 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 6184, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc., Re (2007), 37 C.B.R. (5th) 282, 2007 CarswellOnt 7014, 63 C.C.P.B. 125 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Fraser Papers Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4469, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 217, 2009 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8350, 76 C.C.P.B. 254 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Indalex Ltd., Re (2011), 2011 CarswellOnt 2458, 2011 ONCA 265, 2011 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8433, 104 O.R. (3d) 641, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 19, 17 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 194, 331 D.L.R. (4th) 352, 276 O.A.C. 347, 89 C.C.P.B. 39 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 1330 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4467, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 256 O.A.C. 131, 2009 CarswellOnt 7383, 2009 ONCA 833, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 23, 77 C.C.P.B. 161, (sub nom. *Sroule v. Nortel Networks Corp.*) 2010 C.L.L.C. 210-005, (sub nom. *Sroule v. Nortel Networks Corp., Re*) 99 O.R. (3d) 708 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 106, 2012 CarswellOnt 1059 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52(1) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 66] — considered

s. 11.52(2) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 66] — considered

Pension Benefits Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8

Generally — referred to

Régimes complémentaires de retraite, Loi sur les, L.R.Q., c. R-15.1

en général — referred to

Rules considered:

Federal Courts Rules, SOR/98-106

R. 151 — considered

Words and phrases considered:

special payments

. . . [S]pecial (or amortization) payments are required to be made to liquidate a going concern or solvency deficiency in a pension plan as identified in the most recent funding valuation report for the plan that is filed with the applicable pension regulatory authority. The requirement for the employer to make such payments is provided for under applicable provincial pension minimum standards legislation

The courts have characterized special (or amortization) payments as pre-filing obligations which are stayed upon an initial order being granted under the CCAA [*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36].

MOTION by insolvent companies for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, granting super priority to two charges, approving key employee retention plans, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report.

Morawetz J.:

1 This motion was heard on January 12, 2012. On January 16, 2012, the following endorsement was released:

Motion granted. Reasons will follow. Order to go subject to proviso that the Sealing Order is subject to modification, if necessary, after reasons provided.

2 These are those reasons.

Background

3 On January 3, 2012, Timminco Limited ("Timminco") and Bécancour Silicon Inc. ("BSI") (collectively, the "Timminco Entities") applied for and obtained relief under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA").

4 In my endorsement of January 3, 2012, (*Timminco Ltd., Re, 2012 ONSC 106* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])), I stated at [11]: "I am satisfied that the record establishes that the Timminco Entities are insolvent and are 'debtor companies' to which the CCAA applies".

5 On the initial motion, the Applicants also requested an "Administration Charge" and a "Directors. and Officers. Charge" ("D&O Charge"), both of which were granted.

6 The Timminco Entities requested that the Administration Charge rank ahead of the existing security interest of Investissement Quebec ("IQ") but behind all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise, including any deemed trust created under the *Ontario Pension Benefit Act* (the "PBA") or the *Quebec Supplemental Pensions Plans Act* (the "QSPPA") (collectively, the "Encumbrances") in favour of any persons that have not been served with this application.

7 IQ had been served and did not object to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge.

8 At [35] of my endorsement, I noted that the Timminco Entities had indicated their intention to return to court to seek an order granting super priority ranking for both the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge ahead of the Encumbrances.

9 The Timminco Entities now bring this motion for an order:

(a) suspending the Timminco Entities. obligations to make special payments with respect to the pension plans (as defined in the Notice of Motion);

(b) granting super priority to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge;

(c) approving key employee retention plans (the "KERPs") offered by the Timminco Entities to certain employees deemed critical to a successful restructuring and a charge on the current and future assets, undertakings and properties of the Timminco Entities to secure the Timminco Entities. obligations under the KERPs (the "KERP Charge"); and

(d) sealing the confidential supplement (the "Confidential Supplement") to the First Report of FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor").

10 If granted, the effect of the proposed Court-ordered charges in relation to each other would be:

- first, the Administration Charge to the maximum amount of \$1 million;
- second, the KERP Charge (in the maximum amount of \$269,000); and
- third, the D&O Charge (in the maximum amount of \$400,000).

11 The requested relief was recommended and supported by the Monitor. IQ also supported the requested relief. It was, however, opposed by the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers. Union of Canada ("CEP"). The position put forth by counsel to CEP was supported by counsel for the United Steelworkers. Union ("USW").

12 The motion materials were served on all personal property security registrants in Ontario and in Quebec: the members of the Pension Plan Committees for the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan; the Financial Services Commission of Ontario; the Regie de Rentes du Quebec; the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Works International Union; and La Section Locale 184 de Syndicat

Canadien des Communications, De L.Energie et du Papier; and various government entities, including Ontario and Quebec environmental agencies and federal and provincial taxing authorities.

13 Counsel to the Applicants identified the issues on the motion as follows:

- (a) Should this court grant increased priority to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge?
- (b) Should this court grant an order suspending the Timminco Entities. obligations to make the pension contributions with respect to the pension plans?
- (c) Should this court approve the KERPs and grant the KERPs Charge?
- (d) Should this court seal the Confidential Supplement?

14 It was not disputed that the court has the jurisdiction and discretion to order a super priority charge in the context of a CCAA proceeding. However, counsel to CEP submits that this is an extraordinary measure, and that the onus is on the party seeking such an order to satisfy the court that such an order ought to be awarded in the circumstances.

15 The affidavit of Peter A.M. Kalins, sworn January 5, 2012, provides information relating to the request to suspend the payment of certain pension contributions. Paragraphs 14-28 read as follows:

14. The Timminco Entities sponsor the following three pension plans (collectively, the "**Pension Plans**):

- (a) the Retirement Pension Plan for The Haley Plant Hourly Employees of Timminco Metals, A Division of Timminco Limited (Ontario Registration Number 0589648) (the "**Haley Pension Plan**");
- (b) the Régime de rentes pour les employés non syndiqués de Silicium Bécancour Inc. (Québec Registration Number 26042) (the "**Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan**"); and
- (c) the Régime de rentes pour les employés syndiqués de Silicium Bécancour Inc. (Québec Registration Number 32063) (the "**Bécancour Union Pension Plan**").

Haley Pension Plan

15. The Haley Pension plan, sponsored and administered by Timminco, applies to former hourly employees at Timminco's magnesium facility in Haley, Ontario.

16. The Haley Pension Plan was terminated effective as of August 1, 2008 and accordingly, no normal cost contributions are payable in connection with the Haley Pension Plan. As required by the *Ontario Pension Benefits Act* (the "**PBA**"), a wind-up valuation in respect of the Haley Pension Plan was filed with the Financial Services Commission of Ontario ("**FSCO**") detailing the plan's funded status as of the wind-up date, and each year thereafter. As of August 1, 2008, the Haley Pension Plan was in a deficit position on a wind-up basis of \$5,606,700. The PBA requires that the wind-up deficit be paid down in equal annual installments payable annually in advance over a period of no more than five years.

17. As of August 1, 2010, the date of the most recently filed valuation report, the Haley Pension Plan had a wind-up deficit of \$3,922,700. Contributions to the Haley Pension Plan are payable annually in advance every August 1. Contributions in respect of the period from August 1, 2008 to July 31, 2011 totalling \$4,712,400 were remitted to the plan. Contributions in respect of the period from August 1, 2011 to July 31, 2012 were estimated to be \$1,598,500 and have not been remitted to the plan.

18. According to preliminary estimates calculated by the Haley Pension Plan's actuaries, despite Timminco having made contributions of approximately \$4,712,400 during the period from August 1, 2008 to July 31, 2011, as of August 1, 2011, the deficit remaining in the Haley Pension Plan is \$3,102,900.

Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan

19. The Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan, sponsored by BSI, is an on-going pension plan with both defined benefit ("DB") and defined contribution provisions. The plan has four active members and 32 retired and deferred vested members (including surviving spouses).

20. The most recently filed actuarial valuation of the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan performed for funding purposes was performed as of September 30, 2010. As of September 30, 2010, the solvency deficit in the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan was \$3,239,600.

21. In 2011, normal cost contributions payable to this plan totaled approximately \$9,525 per month (or 16.8% of payroll). Amortization payments owing to this plan totaled approximately \$41,710 per month. All contributions in respect of the plan were paid when due in accordance with the *Québec Supplemental Pension Plans Act* (the "QSPPA") and regulations.

Bécancour Union Pension Plan

22. The BSI-sponsored Bécancour Union Pension Plan is an on-going DB pension plan with two active members and 98 retired and deferred vested members (including surviving spouses).

23. The most recently filed actuarial valuation performed for funding purposes was performed as of September 30, 2010. As of September 30, 2010, the solvency deficit in the Bécancour Union Pension Plan was \$7,939,500.

24. In 2011, normal cost contributions payable to the plan totaled approximately \$7,083 per month (or 14.7% of payroll). Amortization payments owing to this plan totaled approximately \$95,300 per month. All contributions in respect of the plan were paid when due in accordance with the *QSPPA* and regulations.

25. BSI unionized employees have the option to transfer their employment to QSLP, under the form of the existing collective bargaining agreement. In the event of such transfer, their pension membership in the Bécancour Union Pension Plan will be transferred to the Quebec Silicon Union Pension Plan (as defined and described in greater detail in the Initial Order Affidavit). Also, in the event that any BSI non-union employees transfer employment to QSLP, their pension membership in the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan would be transferred to the Quebec Silicon Non-Union Pension Plan (as defined and described in greater detail in the Initial Order Affidavit). I am advised by Andrea Boctor of Stikeman Elliott LLP, counsel to the Timminco Entities, and do verily believe that if all of the active members of the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan transfer their employment to QSLP, the Régie des rentes du Québec would have the authority to order that the plans be wound up.

Pension Plan Deficiencies and the Timminco Entities' CCAA Proceedings

26. The assets of the Pension Plans have been severely impacted by market volatility and decreasing long-term interest rates in recent years, resulting in increased deficiencies in the Pension Plans. As a result, the special payments payable with respect to the Haley Plan also increased. As at 2010, total annual special payments for the final three years of the wind-up of the Haley Pension Plan were \$1,598,500 for 2010, \$1,397,000 for 2011 and \$1,162,000 for 2012, payable in advance annually every August 1. By contrast, in 2011 total annual special payments to the Haley Pension Plan for the remaining two years of the wind-up increased to \$1,728,700 for each of 2011 and 2012.

Suspension of Certain Pension Contributions

27. As is evident from the Cashflow Forecast, the Timminco Entities do not have the funds necessary to make any contributions to the Pension Plans other than (a) contributions in respect of normal cost, (b) contributions to the defined contribution provision of the BSI Non-Union Pension Plan, and (c) employee contributions deducted from pay (together, the "**Normal Cost Contributions**"). Timminco currently owes approximately \$1.6 million in respect of special payments to the Haley Pension Plan. In addition, assuming the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Union Pension

Plan are not terminated, as at January 31, 2012, the Timminco Entities will owe approximately \$140,000 in respect of amortization payments under those plans. If the Timminco Entities are required to make the pension contributions other than Normal Cost Contributions (the "**Pension Contributions**"), they will not have sufficient funds to continue operating and will be forced to cease operating to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

28. The Timminco Entities intend to make all normal cost contributions when due. However, management of the Timminco Entities does not anticipate an improvement in their cashflows that would permit the making of Pension Contributions with respect to the Pension Plans during these [CCAA](#) proceedings.

The Position of CEP and USW

16 Counsel to CEP submits that the super priority charge sought by the Timminco Entities would have the effect of subordinating the rights of, *inter alia*, the pension plans, including the statutory trusts that are created pursuant to the [QSPPA](#). In considering this matter, I have proceeded on the basis that this submission extends to the PBA as well.

17 In order to grant a super priority charge, counsel to CEP, supported by USW, submits that the Timminco Entities must show that the application of provincial legislation "would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy". (See *Indalex Ltd., Re, 2011 ONCA 265* (Ont. C.A.) at para. 181.)

18 Counsel to CEP takes the position that the evidence provided by the Timminco Entities falls short of showing the necessity of the super priority charge. Presently, counsel contends that the Applicants have not provided any plan for the purpose of restructuring the Timminco Entities and, absent a restructuring proposal, the affected creditors, including the pension plans, have no reason to believe that their interests will be protected through the issuance of the orders being sought.

19 Counsel to CEP takes the position that the Timminco Entities are requesting extraordinary relief without providing the necessary facts to justify same. Counsel further contends that the Timminco Entities must "wear two hats" and act both in their corporate interest and in the best interest of the pension plan and cannot simply ignore their obligations to the pension plans in favour of the corporation. (See *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, at para. 129.)

20 Counsel to CEP goes on to submit that, where the "two hats" gives rise to a conflict of interest, if a corporation favours its corporate interest rather than its obligations to its fiduciaries, there will be consequences. In *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, the court found that the corporation seeking [CCAA](#) protection had acted in a manner that revealed a conflict with the duties it owed the beneficiaries of pension plans and ordered the corporation to pay the special payments it owed the plans (See *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, at paras. 140 and 207.)

21 In this case, counsel to CEP submits that, given the lack of evidentiary support for the super priority charge, the risk of conflicting interests and the importance of the Timminco Entities. fiduciary duties to the pension plans, the super priority charge ought not to be granted.

22 Although counsel to CEP acknowledges that the court has the discretion in the context of the [CCAA](#) to make orders that override provincial legislation, such discretion must be exercised through a careful weighing of the facts before the court. Only where the applicant proves it is necessary in the context and consistent with the objects of the [CCAA](#) may a judge make an order overriding provincial legislation. (See *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, at paras. 179 and 189.)

23 In the circumstances of this case, counsel to CEP argues that the position of any super priority charge ordered by the court should rank after the pension plans.

24 CEP also takes the position that the Timminco Entities. obligations to the pension plans should not be suspended. Counsel notes that the Timminco Entities have contractual obligations through the collective agreement and pension plan documents to make contributions to the pension plans and, as well, the Timminco Entities owe statutory duties to the beneficiaries of the pension funds pursuant to the [QSPPA](#). Counsel further points out that [s. 49 of the QSPPA](#) provides that any contributions and accrued interest not paid into the pension fund are deemed to be held in trust for the employer.

25 In addition, counsel takes the position that the Court of Appeal for Ontario in *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, confirmed that, in the context of Ontario legislation, all of the contributions an employee owes a pension fund, including the special payments, are subject to the deemed trust provision of the PBA.

26 In this case, counsel to CEP points out that the special payments the Timminco Entities seek to suspend in the amount of \$95,300 per month to the Bécancour Union Pension Plan, and of \$47,743 to the Silicium Union Pension Plan, are payments that are to be held in trust for the beneficiaries of the pension plans. Thus, they argue that the Timminco Entities have a fiduciary obligation to the beneficiaries of the pension plans to hold the funds in trust. Further, the Timminco Entities' request to suspend the special payments to the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Quebec Silicon Union Pension Plan reveals that its interests are in conflict.

27 Counsel also submits that the Timminco Entities have not pointed to a particular reason, other than generalized liquidity problems, as to why they are unable to make special payments to their pension plans.

28 With respect to the KERPs, counsel to CEP acknowledges that the court has the power to approve a KERP, but the court must only do so when it is convinced that it is necessary to make such an order. In this case, counsel contends that the Timminco Entities have not presented any meaningful evidence on the propriety of the proposed KERPs. Counsel notes that the Timminco Entities have not named the KERPs recipients, provided any specific information regarding their involvement with the CCAA proceeding, addressed their replaceability, or set out their individual bonuses. In the circumstances, counsel submits that it would be unfair and inequitable for the court to approve the KERPs requested by the Timminco Entities.

29 Counsel to CEP's final submission is that, in the event the KERPs are approved, they should not be sealed, but rather should be treated in the same manner as other CCAA documents through the Monitor. Alternatively, counsel to CEP submits that a copy of the KERPs should be provided to the Respondent, CEP.

The Position of the Timminco Entities

30 At the time of the initial hearing, the Timminco Entities filed evidence establishing that they were facing severe liquidity issues as a result of, among other things, a low profit margin realized on their silicon metal sales due to a high volume, long-term supply contract at below market prices, a decrease in the demand and market price for solar grade silicon, failure to recoup their capital expenditures incurred in connection with the development of their solar grade operations, and the inability to secure additional funding. The Timminco Entities also face significant pension and environmental remediation legacy costs, and financial costs related to large outstanding debts.

31 I accepted submissions to the effect that without the protection of the CCAA, a shutdown of operations was inevitable, which the Timminco Entities submitted would be extremely detrimental to the Timminco Entities' employees, pensioners, suppliers and customers.

32 As at December 31, 2011, the Timminco Entities' cash balance was approximately \$2.4 million. The 30-day consolidated cash flow forecast filed at the time of the CCAA application projected that the Timminco Entities would have total receipts of approximately \$5.5 million and total operating disbursements of approximately \$7.7 million for net cash outflow of approximately \$2.2 million, leaving an ending cash position as at February 3, 2012 of an estimated \$157,000.

33 The Timminco Entities approached their existing stakeholders and third party lenders in an effort to secure a suitable debtor-in-possession ("DIP") facility. The Timminco Entities' existing stakeholders, Bank of America NA, IQ, and AMG Advance Metallurgical Group NV, have declined to advance any funds to the Timminco Entities at this time. In addition, two thirdparty lenders have apparently refused to enter into negotiations regarding the provision of a DIP Facility.¹

34 The Monitor, in its Second Report, dated January 11, 2012, extended the cash forecast through to February 17, 2012. The Second Report provides explanations for the key variances in actual receipts and disbursements as compared to the January 2, 2012 forecast.

35 There are some timing differences but the Monitor concludes that there are no significant changes in the underlying assumptions in the January 10, 2012 forecast as compared to the January 2, 2012 forecast.

36 The January 10 forecast projects that the ending cash position goes from positive to negative in mid-February.

37 Counsel to the Applicants submits that, based on the latest cash flow forecast, the Timminco Entities currently estimate that additional funding will be required by mid-February in order to avoid an interruption in operations.

38 The Timminco Entities submit that this is an appropriate case in which to grant super priority to the Administration Charge. Counsel submits that each of the proposed beneficiaries will play a critical role in the Timminco Entities restructuring and it is unlikely that the advisors will participate in the CCAA proceedings unless the Administration Charge is granted to secure their fees and disbursements.

39 Statutory Authority to grant such a charge derives from s. 11.52(1) of the CCAA. Subsection 11.52(2) contains the authority to grant super-priority to such a charge:

11.52(1) Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs — On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) Priority — This court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

40 Counsel also submits that the Timminco Entities require the continued involvement of their directors and officers in order to pursue a successful restructuring of their business and/or finances and, due to the significant personal exposure associated with the Timminco Entities liabilities, it is unlikely that the directors and officers will continue their services with the Timminco Entities unless the D&O Charge is granted.

41 Statutory authority for the granting of a D&O charge on a super priority basis derives from s. 11.51 of the CCAA:

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification — On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

(2) Priority — The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) Restriction — indemnification insurance — The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault — The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

Analysis

(i) Administration Charge and D&O Charge

42 It seems apparent that the position of the unions. is in direct conflict with the Applicants. positions.

43 The position being put forth by counsel to the CEP and USW is clearly stated and is quite understandable. However, in my view, the position of the CEP and the USW has to be considered in the context of the practical circumstances facing the Timminco Entities. The Timminco Entities are clearly insolvent and do not have sufficient reserves to address the funding requirements of the pension plans.

44 Counsel to the Applicants submits that without the relief requested, the Timminco Entities will be deprived of the services being provided by the beneficiaries of the charges, to the company's detriment. I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants that it is unlikely that the advisors will participate in the CCAA proceedings unless the Administration Charge is granted to secure their fees and disbursements. I also accept the evidence of Mr. Kalins that the role of the advisors is critical to the efforts of the Timminco Entities to restructure. To expect that the advisors will take the business risk of participating in these proceedings without the security of the charge is neither reasonable nor realistic.

45 Likewise, I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants to the effect that the directors and officers will not continue their service without the D&O Charge. Again, in circumstances such as those facing the Timminco Entities, it is neither reasonable nor realistic to expect directors and officers to continue without the requested form of protection.

46 It logically follows, in my view, that without the assistance of the advisors, and in the anticipated void caused by the lack of a governance structure, the Timminco Entities will be directionless and unable to effectively proceed with any type or form of restructuring under the CCAA.

47 The Applicants argue that the CCAA overrides any conflicting requirements of the QSPPA and the BPA.

48 Counsel submits that the general paramountcy of the CCAA over provincial legislation was confirmed in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 104. In addition, in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, the Court of Appeal held that the doctrine of paramountcy applies either where a provincial and a federal statutory position are in conflict and cannot both be complied with, or where complying with the provincial law will have the effect of frustrating the purpose of the federal law and therefore the intent of Parliament. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 23 (Ont. C.A.).

49 It has long been stated that the purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors, with the purpose of allowing the business to continue. As the Court of Appeal for Ontario stated in *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 36:

In the CCAA context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme...

50 Further, as I indicated in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), this purpose continues to exist regardless of whether a company is actually restructuring or is continuing operations during a sales

process in order to maintain maximum value and achieve the highest price for the benefit of all stakeholders. Based on this reasoning, the fact that Timminco has not provided any plan for restructuring at this time does not change the analysis.

51 The Court of Appeal in *Indalex Ltd., Re* (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 19 (Ont. C.A.) confirmed the CCAA court's ability to override conflicting provisions of provincial statutes where the application of the provincial legislation would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy. The Court stated, *inter alia*, as follows (beginning at paragraph 176):

The CCAA court has the authority to grant a super-priority charge to DIP lenders in CCAA proceedings. I fully accept that the CCAA judge can make an order granting a super-priority charge that has the effect of overriding provincial legislation, including the PBA. ...

...

What of the contention that recognition of the deemed trust will cause DIP lenders to be unwilling to advance funds in CCAA proceedings? It is important to recognize that the conclusion I have reached does not mean that a finding of paramountcy will never be made. That determination must be made on a case by case basis. There may well be situations in which paramountcy is invoked and the record satisfies the CCAA judge that application of the provincial legislation would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy.

52 The Timminco Entities seek approval to suspend Special Payments in order to maintain sufficient liquidity to continue operations for the benefit of all stakeholders, including employees and pensioners. It is clear that based on the January 2 forecast, as modified by the Second Report, the Timminco Entities have insufficient liquidity to make the Special Payments at this time.

53 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that where it is necessary to achieve the objective of the CCAA, the court has the jurisdiction to make an order under the CCAA granting, in the present case, super priority over the Encumbrances for the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge, even if such an order conflicts with, or overrides, the QSPPA or the PBA.

54 Further, the Timminco Entities submit that the doctrine of paramountcy is properly invoked in this case and that the court should order that the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge have super priority over the Encumbrances in order to ensure the continued participation of the beneficiaries of these charges in the Timminco Entities. CCAA proceedings.

55 The Timminco Entities also submit that payment of the pension contributions should be suspended. These special (or amortization) payments are required to be made to liquidate a going concern or solvency deficiency in a pension plan as identified in the most recent funding valuation report for the plan that is filed with the applicable pension regulatory authority. The requirement for the employer to make such payments is provided for under applicable provincial pension minimum standards legislation.

56 The courts have characterized special (or amortization) payments as pre-filing obligations which are stayed upon an initial order being granted under the CCAA. (See *AbitibiBowater inc., Re* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 285 (C.S. Que.); *Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc., Re* (2007), 37 C.B.R. (5th) 282 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Fraser Papers Inc., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 217 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

57 I accept the submission of counsel to the Applicants to the effect that courts in Ontario and Quebec have addressed the issue of suspending special (or amortization) payments in the context of a CCAA restructuring and have ordered the suspension of such payments where the failure to stay the obligation would jeopardize the business of the debtor company and the company's ability to restructure.

58 The Timminco Entities also submit that there should be no director or officer liability incurred as a result of a court-ordered suspension of payment of pension contributions. Counsel references *Fraser Papers*, where Pepall J. stated:

Given that I am ordering that the special payments need not be made during the stay period pending further order of the Court, the Applicants and the officers and directors should not have any liability for failure to pay them in that same period.

The latter should be encouraged to remain during the CCAA process so as to govern and assist with the restructuring effort and should be provided with protection without the need to have recourse to the Director's Charge.

59 Importantly, *Fraser Papers* also notes that there is no priority for special payments in bankruptcy. In my view, it follows that the employees and former employees are not prejudiced by the relief requested since the likely outcome should these proceedings fail is bankruptcy, which would not produce a better result for them. Thus, the "two hats" doctrine from *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, discussed earlier in these reasons at [20], would not be infringed by the relief requested. Because it would avoid bankruptcy, to the benefit of both the Timminco Entities and beneficiaries of the pension plans, the relief requested would not favour the interests of the corporate entity over its obligations to its fiduciaries.

60 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that where it is necessary to achieve the objective of the CCAA, the court has the jurisdiction to make an order under the CCAA suspending the payment of the pension contributions, even if such order conflicts with, or overrides, the QSPPA or the PBA.

61 The evidence has established that the Timminco Entities are in a severe liquidity crisis and, if required to make the pension contributions, will not have sufficient funds to continue operating. The Timminco Entities would then be forced to cease operations to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

62 On the facts before me, I am satisfied that the application of the QSPPA and the PBA would frustrate the Timminco Entities ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy. Indeed, while the Timminco Entities continue to make Normal Cost Contributions to the pension plans, requiring them to pay what they owe in respect of special and amortization payments for those plans would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, forcing them to cease operations to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

63 In my view, this is exactly the kind of result the CCAA is intended to avoid. Where the facts demonstrate that ordering a company to make special payments in accordance with provincial legislation would have the effect of forcing the company into bankruptcy, it seems to me that to make such an order would frustrate the rehabilitative purpose of the CCAA. In such circumstances, therefore, the doctrine of paramountcy is properly invoked, and an order suspending the requirement to make special payments is appropriate (see *ATB Financial* and *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*).

64 In my view, the circumstances are such that the position put forth by the Timminco Entities must prevail. I am satisfied that bankruptcy is not the answer and that, in order to ensure that the purpose and objective of the CCAA can be fulfilled, it is necessary to invoke the doctrine of paramountcy such that the provisions of the CCAA override those of QSPPA and the PBA.

65 There is a clear inter-relationship between the granting of the Administration Charge, the granting of the D&O Charge and extension of protection for the directors and officers for the company's failure to pay the pension contributions.

66 In my view, in the absence of the court granting the requested super priority and protection, the objectives of the CCAA would be frustrated. It is not reasonable to expect that professionals will take the risk of not being paid for their services, and that directors and officers will remain if placed in a compromised position should the Timminco Entities continue CCAA proceedings without the requested protection. The outcome of the failure to provide these respective groups with the requested protection would, in my view, result in the overwhelming likelihood that the CCAA proceedings would come to an abrupt halt, followed, in all likelihood, by bankruptcy proceedings.

67 If bankruptcy results, the outcome for employees and pensioners is certain. This alternative will not provide a better result for the employees and pensioners. The lack of a desirable alternative to the relief requested only serves to strengthen my view that the objectives of the CCAA would be frustrated if the relief requested was not granted.

68 For these reasons, I have determined that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to both the Administrative Charge and D&O Charge.

69 I have also concluded that it is both necessary and appropriate to suspend the Timminco Entities' obligations to make pension contributions with respect to the Pension Plans. In my view, this determination is necessary to allow the Timminco Entities to restructure or sell the business as a going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders.

70 I am also satisfied that, in order to encourage the officers and directors to remain during the CCAA proceedings, an order should be granted relieving them from any liability for the Timminco Entities' failure to make pension contributions during the CCAA proceedings. At this point in the restructuring, the participation of its officers and directors is of vital importance to the Timminco Entities.

(ii) The KERPs

71 Turning now to the issue of the employee retention plans (KERPs), the Timminco Entities seek an order approving the KERPs offered to certain employees who are considered critical to successful proceedings under the CCAA.

72 In this case, the KERPs have been approved by the board of directors of Timminco. The record indicates that in the opinion of the Chief Executive Officer and the Special Committee of the Board, all of the KERPs participants are critical to the Timminco Entities' CCAA proceedings as they are experienced employees who have played central roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date and will play critical roles in the steps taken in the future. The total amount of the KERPs in question is \$269,000. KERPs have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings where the retention of certain employees has been deemed critical to a successful restructuring. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, [2009] O.J. No. 1044 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), and *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

73 In *Grant Forest Products*, Newbould J. noted that the business judgment of the board of directors of the debtor company and the monitor should rarely be ignored when it comes to approving a KERP charge.

74 The Monitor also supports the approval of the KERPs and, following review of several court-approved retention plans in CCAA proceedings, is satisfied that the KERPs are consistent with the current practice for retention plans in the context of a CCAA proceeding and that the quantum of the proposed payments under the KERPs are reasonable in the circumstances.

75 I accept the submissions of counsel to the Timminco Entities. I am satisfied that it is necessary, in these circumstances, that the KERPs participants be incentivized to remain in their current positions during the CCAA process. In my view, the continued participation of these experienced and necessary employees will assist the company in its objectives during its restructuring process. If these employees were not to remain with the company, it would be necessary to replace them. It is reasonable to conclude that the replacement of such employees would not provide any substantial economic benefits to the company. The KERPs are approved.

76 The Timminco Entities have also requested that the court seal the Confidential Supplement which contains copies of the unredacted KERPs, taking the position that the KERPs contain sensitive personal compensation information and that the disclosure of such information would compromise the commercial interests of the Timminco Entities and harm the KERPs participants. Further, the KERPs participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and salary information will be kept confidential. Counsel relies on *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) at para. 53 where Iacobucci J. adopted the following test to determine when a sealing order should be made:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh the deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

77 CEP argues that the CCAA process should be open and transparent to the greatest extent possible and that the KERPs should not be sealed but rather should be treated in the same manner as other CCAA documents through the Monitor. In the alternative, counsel to the CEP submits that a copy of the KERPs should be provided to the Respondent, CEP.

78 In my view, at this point in time in the restructuring process, the disclosure of this personal information could compromise the commercial interests of the Timminco Entities and cause harm to the KERP participants. It is both necessary and important for the parties to focus on the restructuring efforts at hand rather than to get, in my view, potentially side-tracked on this issue. In my view, the Confidential Supplement should be and is ordered sealed with the proviso that this issue can be revisited in 45 days.

Disposition

79 In the result, the motion is granted. An order shall issue:

- (a) suspending the Timminco Entities. obligation to make special payments with respect to the pension plans (as defined in the Notice of Motion);
- (b) granting super priority to the Administrative Charge and the D&O Charge;
- (c) approving the KERPs and the grant of the KERP Charge;
- (d) authorizing the sealing of the Confidential Supplement to the First Report of the Monitor.

Motion granted.

Footnotes

- 1 In a subsequent motion relating to approval of a DIP Facility, the Timminco Entities acknowledged they had reached an agreement with a third-party lender with respect to providing DIP financing, subject to court approval. Further argument on this motion will be heard on February 6, 2012.

TAB M

2009 CarswellOnt 6184
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 6184, [2009] O.J. No. 4286, 181 A.C.W.S. (3d) 853, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, C-36. AS AMENDED**

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST
GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

Pepall J.

Judgment: October 13, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8241-OOCL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers, Jeremy Dacks for Applicants
Alan Merskey for Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Edmond Lamek for Asper Family
Peter H. Griffin, Peter J. Osborne for Management Directors, Royal Bank of Canada
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.e Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Miscellaneous

Debtor companies experienced financial problems due to deteriorating economic environment in Canada — Debtor companies took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets — Economic conditions did not improve nor did financial circumstances of debtor companies — They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees — Application was brought for relief pursuant to [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) — Application granted — Proposed monitor was appointed — Companies qualified as debtor companies under Act — Debtor companies were in default of their obligations — Required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under [s. 11\(2\)](#) were filed — Stay of proceedings was granted to create stability and allow debtor companies to pursue their restructuring — Partnerships in application carried on operations that were integral and closely interrelated to business of debtor companies — It was just and convenient to grant relief requested with respect to partnerships — Debtor-in-possession financing was approved — Administration charge was granted — Debtor companies' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers was granted — Directors' and officers' charge was granted — Key employee retention plans were approved — Extension of time for calling of annual general meeting was granted.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 1995 CarswellOnt 36, 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187, 2006 ABQB 153, 2006 CarswellAlta 446 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

General Publishing Co., Re (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216, 2003 CarswellOnt 275 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2004 BCSC 745, 2004 CarswellBC 1249, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210, 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re (2009), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 71, 2009 CarswellOnt 391 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.

Chapter 15 — referred to

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44

Generally — referred to

s. 106(6) — referred to

s. 133(1) — referred to

s. 133(1)(b) — referred to

s. 133(3) — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(2) — referred to

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 23 — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 137(2) — considered

Rules considered:

Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194

R. 38.09 — referred to

APPLICATION for relief pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Pepall J.:

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLTP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLTP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLTP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*.² It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned

by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

8 The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

9 Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

11 Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

12 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

13 On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

14 On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other

guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

16 The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

17 In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

18 Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

19 The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

21 The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

22 The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the [CCAA](#).

Proposed Order

23 I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

24 This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the [CCAA](#) that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the [CCAA](#). In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the [CCAA](#), namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the [CCAA](#). Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Stelco Inc., Re*⁴. Absent these [CCAA](#) proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

26 Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under [section 11\(2\) of the CCAA](#) have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

27 Under [section 11 of the CCAA](#), the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

28 The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

29 While the [CCAA](#) definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of [CCAA](#) proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*⁵; *Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re*⁶; and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*⁷. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and

obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of [section 2 of the CCAA](#) and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re*⁸ and *Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re*⁹

(C) DIP Financing

31 Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the [CCAA](#) now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
 - (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
 - (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
 - (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
 - (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
 - (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
 - (g) the monitor's report referred to in [paragraph 23\(1\)\(b\)](#), if any.

32 In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the [CCAA](#) in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for

employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

33 Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to \$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

34 Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

35 Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

36 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

37 While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

38 I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

39 As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

40 Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

41 The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

42 Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

43 In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television

programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

44 The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

45 Again, the recent amendments to the [CCAA](#) allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.
- (4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

46 I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

48 The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *General Publishing Co., Re*¹⁰ Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them

50 Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re*¹¹ have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

52 In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

53 The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the *CBCA*, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

54 CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

55 The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

56 Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

57 Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

58 This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

59 I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

60 Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

Application granted.

Footnotes

1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended

2 R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.

3 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.

4 (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.).

5 (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

6 [2009] O.J. No. 349 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

7 (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.).

8 (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

9 (2004), 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.).

10 (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216 (Ont. S.C.J.).

11 [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

12 [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.).

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.